

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Doctrine of Prayer is engaging attention as it never did before. This is one of the results of the war. But before the war began, the mind of the Editor of this magazine was drawn to the subject. It seemed to him that much of the neglect of Prayer, which was then so evident, was due to ignorance. He resolved to edit a volume on the Christian Doctrine of Prayer to serve as the basis of Sunday or weekday evening addresses or Bible Class lectures. The volume is now ready. Not a few men make their arrangements for next winter's work early in the summer. Perhaps they will look at this book. They will find the subject of Prayer, for the understanding of which so many hearts and minds are ready, set forth clearly and fully, in touch with modern thought, and well illustrated from modern literature.

There is a chapter on Prayer in Dr. J. R. ILLINGWORTH's new volume. His subject is *The Gospel Miracles* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). But there is much more in the book than that title would lead one to look for. There is not a little philosophy. For Dr. ILLINGWORTH's mind is essentially philosophical. He loves to handle facts, but he loves better to draw conclusions from them. He discusses the miracles in the Gospels, but at much greater length he discusses miracle. And it is quite appropriate to his whole

manner that he should devote a chapter to the Christian doctrine of Prayer.

Dr. ILLINGWORTH recognizes the difficulty of discussing prayer. No doubt he recognizes also the difficulty of believing in it. But we are well on the way to overcoming the scientific and even the philosophical difficulties that have gathered round the belief in prayer. The difficulty of discussing it we shall never be able to overcome.

For not only is prayer apt to escape from under discussion, but, besides that, we have not the evidence for a satisfactory discussion in our hands. The man of science gathers his facts, compares them with other facts, classifies them, and draws his legitimate conclusions. The man of prayer has only the facts of his own personal experience to work with. These are to him convincing enough, but he cannot spread them out in the sight of other men in order to convince them. In every attempt at a declaration of what prayer has been in a man's life much is lost of the meaning and power of it. The very attempt is hard to make. For the life of prayer is a hidden life. Those who are ready to criticize its efficacy are those who do not pray. They are therefore unable to understand its efficacy. There is no doubt that much can be said in favour of prayer, and never more than at the present time; and Dr.

ILLINGWORTH proceeds to say it. But it is right to admit at the outset that no argument for prayer will convince a man who does not pray.

Perhaps the commonest conception of Prayer is that it is a crutch. This conception has been the occasion of much mock heroic literature. For the acceptance of such literature Emerson is chiefly responsible. But even those who have too much of the mind of Christ to come under Emerson's influence are sometimes carried away by the idea that the best use of prayer is to ask God to make us independent of prayer. 'Prayer,' says Emerson, 'that craves a particular commodity, anything less than all good, is vicious. Prayer is the contemplation of the facts of life from the highest point of view. It is the soliloquy of a beholding and jubilant soul. It is the spirit of God pronouncing his works good. But prayer, as a means to effect a private end, is meanness and theft. It pre-supposes dualism, and not unity in nature and consciousness. As soon as the man is at one with God he will not beg. He will then see prayer in all action. The prayer of the farmer kneeling in his field to weed it, the prayer of the rower kneeling with the stroke of his oar, are prayers heard throughout nature.'

Prayer is regarded as a crutch by those also who resort to it only in times of dire distress. This is wholly at variance with Christ's precept and Christ's example. Christ lived by prayer and He intended His followers to live by it. He taught His disciples to look upon the Spirit and all the gifts of the Spirit as to be had for the asking, and only for the asking. No doubt there are good gifts of God that come to us without prayer. He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth His rain on the just and also on the unjust. But even temporal gifts like these are to be asked for. Why? That when we receive them we may appreciate them and turn them to their most profitable use.

There is an article in *The Harvard Theological Review* for April on 'Religious Reserve.' It is not a pleasant article. The author, a Unitarian minister of the name of Edward F. HAYWARD, is too conscious of his own superiority. Almost an unbeliever himself, he has nothing but scorn for those who speak as if they had some assurance of God, or some intimate experience of His love in their lives.

He has seen preachers, he says, who spoke on Sunday as if they knew something about God, and on Monday were attracted by 'the modesty and restfulness of agnosticism.' He quotes with satisfaction the saying of Goethe: 'With the people, and especially with the clergymen, who have Him daily on their tongues, God becomes a phrase, a mere name, which they utter without any accompanying idea. But if they were penetrated by His greatness they would rather be dumb, and for very reverence would not name Him.'

The article is as ill-timed as it is unpleasant. We need no warning at present to be reserved in our religious conversation. We are much too reserved. What we need to be told by such a writer as the author of this article is simply not to run beyond experience in our speech. But that is not in his thoughts. It seems to him that God should be kept at so respectful a distance that no speech of what He is or what He has done for us could ever be possible.

There is an article of another kind in *The Times* for April 6. Its author is Mr. E. A. BURROUGHS, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford.

What Mr. BURROUGHS finds at the present time is 'a persistent vein of scepticism in all our faith.' We do not deny the existence of God. 'We claim that there is a Fact which is the crucial factor in the present situation'—the present situation being due to the war. We give a place to God in our scheme of existence, but it is a modest place with a shadowy meaning. And so our belief 'falls

short of dynamic value, and hardly issues in outward life.'

It is therefore not for greater reserve about God that Mr. BURROUGHS pleads; it is for greater assurance and franker speech.

First it is for greater assurance. He would have us 'believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.' To believe so is to be consistent. For already we know that the spiritual is the real and the permanent. It is our knowledge of this that seems to make life possible. Already we are living by faith—far more of us than recognize it. Already we endure as seeing that which is invisible. 'If 19th-century materialism were not already dead the war would certainly have killed it.' And yet we hesitate and halt between two opinions.

Mr. BURROUGHS calls for consistency—'that hardest of graces for Britons to acquire.' If we believe, why do we not obtain the benefit of our belief? We must give the unseen things their place and value. We have not shaken ourselves quite clear of materialism. Having driven it out in the name of physical science, we have let it in again in the name of psychology. Conversion is a matter of psychological experiment. But, says Mr. BURROUGHS, 'because there may be a psychological explanation of conversion, it does not follow that there is no theological cause. The tappings of the wireless "receiver" may no doubt be explained as due to electrical disturbances in the immediate neighbourhood of the ship's mast; but that is not the whole explanation, nor the significant part of it.'

What Mr. BURROUGHS pleads for, therefore, in the present situation is the disuse of vague and distant phrases like 'the spiritual factor.' Let us boldly substitute the conception of a personal God, *and act accordingly*. 'We have to learn from our enemies. We may not approve their concep-

tion of God, nor like their ways of expressing their trust in Him. But the fact remains that in Germany the churches are full, while here they are—well, also "as usual." And the Kaiser's recognitions of God are perhaps a thing which our Press and politicians might occasionally imitate instead of deriding. If we think God in any way counts in the war, we might at least not seem to wish to forget it.'

That then is the first thing, we must be surer of God and give Him a larger place in our lives. The other thing is that we must speak more frequently about Him. Therein lies salvation for ourselves as for others. For it is 'if thou shalt confess with thy mouth,' as well as 'believe in thine heart' that 'thou shalt be saved.'

Is it not possible? Is our British reserve an immovable wall? We are doing it already in a way that is closely related. Very finely Mr. BURROUGHS says: 'Trouble has been bringing many of us nearer to one another, and showing us how alike we all are in the deepest things. And to be able to talk a little about them has brought, to many reserved people, a great enrichment of life. We have felt at work in us the process which St. Paul calls "the mutual building of each into each." That way, we all recognize, lies the true path of human progress, whether we think of the Eternal Goal at the end of it as "the Brotherhood of Man" or "the building up of the Body of Christ." Could we not be more consistent here also, and more often, and as a duty, give one another the benefit of our faith as well as of our doubts? True corporate life and feeling, whether inside or outside what we call "the Churches," can only be built on the freest interchange of personality between individuals, deliberately surrendering their right to spiritual isolation, and admitting to one another their common indebtedness and devotion to the common source of their spiritual life.'

What do we wait for? We wait for a lead. Where is the lead to come from? From the

clergy, perhaps. But writing in *The Times*, Mr. BURROUGHS writes to the laity. He bids them wait for no lead. 'Every man in Christ is by rights "a man under authority, having soldiers under him"; and the *raison d'être* of a Christian is to be a leader of men. Every one of us, however humble, is called to give a lead in his own surroundings. In family and business life, in the small problems of personal action, in the casual intercourse of the street or the train, the spiritual man will find abundant opportunity of disclosing his own standards, his own perspective, and making others conscious of the light by which he lives. Only he must subdue his horror of "giving himself away": to do so is half the battle of leadership.

Pour forth and bravely do your part,
O knights of the unshielded heart!
Forth and for ever forward!—out
From prudent turret and redoubt!

What is the value of 'belief' in the New Testament? Take an example. In Acts 13¹² we are told that Sergius Paulus, the Proconsul of Cyprus, 'when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the teaching of the Lord.' Does that mean that Sergius Paulus was converted? Does it mean that he became a Christian?

Mr. RACKHAM, who is the author of the best English Commentary on the Acts, says it does not. For to him 'it seems incredible that at this date a Roman proconsul could have been converted.' He does not mean that it was beyond the power of God to convert a proconsul. But it would have made such a stir that all the world was bound to hear of it. The Dean of WINCHESTER agrees. Dean FURNEAUX is the author of the latest Commentary on the Acts, and it runs Mr. RACKHAM'S hard for the first place. Dr. FURNEAUX agrees. 'The conversion of a Proconsul,' he says, 'would have been an event of the first importance, such as we should expect to find recorded even by

secular historians, since it would almost certainly have necessitated the resignation of his office which involved official patronage of idolatrous worship.'

Sir W. M. RAMSAY discusses the question in his new book, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s.).

He is at one with Mr. RACKHAM and the Dean of WINCHESTER. To believe, he says, is not necessarily to be converted and become a Christian. The case of Simon Magus is almost conclusive evidence that sometimes it means no more than intellectual assent. In the language of St. Luke there are three stages in the process called salvation. First there is belief. After belief comes 'turning to the Lord,' of which the seal is baptism. The last stage is the settled Christian life.

Now it usually happens that St. Luke names only the first of these stages. He takes it for granted that the other two will follow. But he knew that the second and third stages might not follow, and so sometimes he adds them or at least one of them. Accordingly, Sir W. M. RAMSAY thinks that the state of mind called believing sometimes advances no further than intellectual assent and emotional impression; and it would not be safe to assert that belief always was followed even by baptism.

There is no probability that the Proconsul was baptized. If he had been baptized St. Luke would have been sure to mention it, for he pays great regard to the attitude of the Romans to the new religion. In the same way it is said of those to whom St. Paul preached in Athens that 'certain men also clave to him and believed, among whom was Dionysius the Areopagite and Damaris.' No baptism seems to have been administered, and no Church was founded. The effect produced on a few persons may have been genuine and deep, but the Apostle did not remain to follow it up, and

Sir W. M. RAMSAY believes that no real conversions were made in Athens.

From these cases, then, and from all that is said in the New Testament, the conclusion seems unavoidable that Sergius Paulus did not become a Christian. But, outside the New Testament, evidence has been found which persuades Sir W. M. RAMSAY that the conclusion is wrong.

The evidence is obtained from inscriptions. First there is an inscription which was discovered in Pisidian Antioch after the systematic excavation of that city began in 1912. In that inscription there occurs the name of Lucius Sergius Paullus the younger. It was at once perceived by Sir W. M. RAMSAY, and it has since been admitted by other scholars, that Lucius Sergius Paullus the younger is the son of Sergius Paulus the Cyprus Proconsul in the Book of Acts.

Next there is an inscription which has been published for nearly thirty years but hitherto has been totally misunderstood. This inscription occupies the whole of a large block of limestone which was set up in Antioch in honour of a distinguished citizen and his wife. The block is broken, only the second part of the lady's name was at first read, and no one thought anything about it. But in 1913 the other part was discovered and now the whole name can be read. The name is Sergia Paulla.

What does it signify? It signifies that L. Sergius Paullus, the son of Sergius Paulus the Proconsul of Cyprus, was governor of Galatia, and that during his office his sister was married to this citizen of Antioch. Now it is quite certain, from his position as governor of Galatia, that L. Sergius Paullus the younger was a pagan. It is nearly as certain that his sister was a Christian.

For this inscription was erected by her oldest son, and it is in Greek. That is a degeneration which at this early age would have been impossible

for a Roman and a pagan. But if Sergia Paulla's son was a Christian, it was natural and almost inevitable that he should write in Greek. Sir W. M. RAMSAY's conclusion is that he learned his Christianity from his mother, and that his mother learned it from her father, the Sergius Paulus of the narrative in the Acts.

Mr. Arnold J. TOYNBEE has written a book on *Nationality and the War* (Dent; 7s. 6d. net). Its title gives little indication of its contents. It is an elaborate forecast of the changes that are to take place on the map of the world when the war is over. They who will have the making of these changes must take account of the great fact of Nationality. That is the explanation of the title.

Who will have the making of the changes on the map of the world? Mr. TOYNBEE believes it will be ourselves and our Allies. But he is cautious and very considerate. He does not say that this and that will take place 'when we win.' He says 'if we win.' For he has a much clearer conception of the work that has to be done before we win than the confident comfortable reader of the British daily press. He believes that we will win. He wrote in January. If he were writing now he would express himself more emphatically. But all he writes he writes on the understanding that when the war is over victory will be with Britain and her Allies. The changes on the map will have to be made by them.

Meantime Britain and her Allies have to win. Why forecast the future? Because, says Mr. TOYNBEE, that is our duty and we dare not shirk it. It is our duty now: we dare not postpone it. If we wait until that day when we read in the newspaper that the war is over, we shall find that we have made a serious and irreparable mistake. For we shall be only at the beginning of our real task. The reconstruction of the map of the World in many places, of the map of Europe in nearly every place, will still be in our hands. Our policy,

after hostilities, will be decided by our own Government *relying for its authority on the country behind it*. And the country will not be able to use wisely the immense power of decision which will fall upon it.

Mr. TOYNBEE does not expect that every man 'who has a vote' will make himself acquainted with the past history and the present condition of every country in Europe. There are men like himself to whom much of the ground is familiar, but they are few. What he expects of the British voter is that he would acquaint himself with the great principles which must guide the Government in its decisions, and with as much as he can of the way in which these principles ought to be applied in every particular case. Both are set forth in this book, the principles in a short introductory chapter, the application in the rest of its five hundred pages.

The greatest principle of all, the great fact which has to be taken account of in the settlement of every problem that arises after the war, is Nationality. But before we consider what Nationality is, we must come to some decision on two matters of ethical interest. We must decide whether we are to be moved by the desire for revenge, and we must decide whether we are to be moved by the instinct of plunder.

Are we to be moved by the desire for revenge? We answer, Yes. We are making that answer every day. At the very beginning of the war, a certain French word was unfortunately translated by the English word 'revenge,' though it does not mean revenge. That gave us encouragement. Then came the atrocities in Belgium, in Flanders, in Poland, and the outrages on the English coast. Yet Mr. TOYNBEE tells us that if we make our decisions after the war in the spirit of revenge, we shall lose that very thing for which we have gone to war—the end of war. For 'if we beat Germany and then humiliate her, she will never rest,' he says, 'till she has "redeemed her honour," by

humiliating us more cruelly in turn. Instead of being free to return to our own pressing business, we shall have to be constantly on the watch against her. Two great nations will sit idle, weapon in hand, like two Afghans in their loopholed towers when the blood feud is between them; and we shall have sacrificed deliberately and to an ever-increasing extent, for the blood feud grows by geometrical progression, the very freedom for which we are now giving our lives.'

Are we to be moved by the instinct of plunder? Again we answer, Yes. We are making *that* answer every day. And have we not reason? Mr. TOYNBEE knows that we have reason. Yet he asks us to consider. Modern wealth is international. That is its characteristic feature. 'Economic gain and loss,' he says, 'is shared by the whole world, and the shifting of the economic balance does not correspond to the moves in the game of diplomatists and armies. Germany's economic growth has been a phenomenon quite independent of her political ambitions, and Germany's economic ruin would compromise something far greater than Germany's political future—the whole world's prosperity. British wealth, among the rest, would be dealt a deadly wound by Germany's economic death, and it would be idle to pump Germany's last life-blood into our veins, if we were automatically draining them of our own blood in the process.'

That issue is enough. It is not the only issue, but it is enough. Mr. TOYNBEE passes to Nationality. In the great regrouping that is to take place, a regrouping which we earnestly hope will have some permanence, respect must be had to the claims of Nationality.

Now Nationality is not easy to define. 'Like all great forces in human life, it is nothing material or mechanical, but a subjective psychological feeling in living people. This feeling can be kindled by the presence of one or several of a series of factors: a common country, especially if it is a

well-defined physical region, like an island, a river basin, or a mountain mass; a common language, especially if it has given birth to a literature; a common religion; and that much more impalpable force, a common tradition or sense of memories shared from the past.'

But these definitions do not all apply to every nation. Perhaps they do not all apply to any nation in the Earth. 'Great Britain is a nation by geography and tradition. Ireland is an island smaller still and more compact, and is further unified by the almost complete predominance of the same English language, for the Keltic speech is incomparably less vigorous here than in Wales; yet the absence of common tradition combines with religious differences to divide the country into two nationalities, at present sharply distinct from one another and none the less hostile because their national psychology is strikingly the same. Germany is divided by religion in precisely the same way as Ireland, her common tradition is hardly stronger, and her geographical boundaries quite vague: yet she has built up her present concentrated national feeling in three generations. Italy has geography, language and tradition to bind her together, and yet a more vivid tradition is able to separate the Ticinese from his neighbours, and bind him to people of alien speech and religion beyond a great mountain range. The Armenian nationality does not occupy a continuous territory, but lives by language and religion. The Jews speak the language of the country where they sojourn, but religion and tradition hold them together. The agnostic Jew accepts not only the language but all the other customs of his adopted countrymen, but tradition by itself is too strong for him: he remains a Jew and cannot be assimilated.'

That being so, we must judge each case on its own merits. National problems hitherto remote and uninteresting to us, must be taken up in earnest, that we may get as near to the truth concerning them as we possibly can. We must listen to the wishes of the different populations. We

must consider how far we can reconcile their wishes with one another and with geography. We must, as far as in us lies, come to the conference at the end of the war—which, says Mr. TOYNBEE, is so much more important than the war itself—with a clear idea of the alternative solutions, and a mature judgment upon their relative merits.

One example will be enough. Let it be Poland.

The nation of the Poles is at present partitioned between three empires, Germany, Austria, and Russia. The peaceful maintenance of the *status quo* in Europe meant for the Poles the perpetuation of this calamity for an indefinite period, perhaps for ever. The outbreak of war, the common disaster of their taskmasters, kindled for them a glimmer of fresh hope.

What can the Poles hope to gain from the war? Their highest hope can be no more than the creation of a united national state, enjoying internal autonomy but incorporated in a larger political organization. And the question is whether that larger organization is to be Russia, Austria, or Germany. Each of these Powers would be glad to make concessions to the Poles already subject to it in order to attract within its border upon the same terms the remaining sections of the nation.

Russia has made a great offer already. But Russia is the traditional enemy of the Polish nation. 'The two peoples have been rival leaders of the Slavonic world. Poland drew her culture from the Latin West, and her peasantry remained staunch to the Catholic Church during the crisis of the Reformation: Russia took upon herself the inheritance of the Byzantine Empire. Since 1814 more than half Poland's territory and population, including the national capital, Warsaw, has been incorporated in the Russian Empire. Accordingly, the national revolts of 1831 and 1863 were directed primarily, and in effect solely, against Russian rule, and in the concerted repression which they provoked from the three powers, the Russian Govern-

ment has taken the lead. The most cruel symbol of Poland's humiliation is the flaunting Orthodox Cathedral planted in the chief public square of Warsaw.'

Austria-Hungary, the 'ramshackle empire,' has been unable, perhaps it has been unwilling, to take the place of prime oppressor. Its true policy has been to become a 'happy family,' in which various nationalities should live and let live side by side. And the Poles have had exceptional favour. 'In 1869 the province of Galicia, Austria's share in the Polish spoils, was granted a far-reaching measure of Home Rule, and Polish was declared the normal language of its administration and higher education.'

These concessions have made the Austrian Poles the most loyal citizens of the Empire. The Polish members of the Austrian Reichsrath are looked upon as the 'government party.' On them the ministry can always rely for the voting of supplies and the passing of army bills. When the Russians invaded Galicia the Polish population rose *en masse* against them. They have certainly

not abandoned the hope of national reunion, but they look for it not within the Russian, but within the Austrian Empire.

But Germany has to be reckoned with. And the Germans have treated the Poles within their borders so badly that if to a reunited Poland the alternative were offered of Russia or Austro-Germany, they would undoubtedly say Russia. The Poles love not Russia, but they love Germany less. Now they already see that in the present alliance between Germany and Austria the predominant partner is Germany. If Germany and Austria win the war, it will be Germany's and not Austria's policy that will be imposed on Europe in general and on Poland in particular. The Poles shudder to think what that will mean. In the progress of the war Poles and Russians are being fused together in feeling by the fire of a common hate. Mr. TOYNBEE firmly believes that when we and our Allies win, the erection of a reunited Poland within the Russian Empire is almost assured. The Polish subjects of Germany will vote to a man for liberation from her dominion, and they will carry the Austrian Poles with them.

The Study of Theology.

BY ALBAN G. WIDGERY, M.A.(CAMB.), UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS.

A CAREFUL study of the history of particular sciences such as mathematics, physics, biology, and history leads to the conclusion that, apart from any consideration of the ease or difficulty of the research in any case, those sciences have made the greatest and most rapid progress which have been prosecuted by appropriate methods and untrammelled by external authority. The liberty of the student is not to be confused with caprice, although at the inception of every science many hypotheses have been in the highest degree arbitrary. The demand for liberty, which is now satisfied in almost every branch of research, is simply to follow reason and experience wherever they may lead. Freedom soon becomes distinguished from caprice in that individuals recognize

the necessity of co-operation and of the advantage of working according to methods especially appropriate to the subject under investigation. Freedom modified by method, and method made more or less elastic through freedom, have enabled advance which would otherwise have been impossible. Freedom is an attitude of mind, positive in relation to reason, negative in relation to any external power. Method is the mode of scientific procedure dependent upon the nature of the data which are being considered and the aim to be realized.

In the Western world research in all its branches was for long under the control of the ecclesiastical powers. This may be admitted without the necessity of denying what the Church did for

educational progress within its own limits. Except for the individual efforts of a few thinkers, such as Galileo and Bruno, the demand for freedom first arose in the sphere of religion itself. In the Protestant Reformation this demand met with a certain degree of satisfaction. At that time, however, there was no clear notion of scientific and progressive methods of study, and the deposed authority of the Church was soon replaced by that of the letter of the Scriptures. The freedom attained was more real and continuous in those branches of research which acquired definite methods of procedure, as did the investigation of nature under the guidance of Bacon, Newton, and Kepler. Little by little the spirit of freedom has become predominant in all regions of profane knowledge, and to it we owe in great measure the results which have been obtained.

Theology alone is still fettered by the limitations imposed upon it by an authority external to itself. Theology alone still suffers from absolute uncertainty and poverty of method. For in the Christian world Theology has been and is almost entirely dogmatic, starting with certain quite arbitrary assumptions and arguing to certain foregone conclusions. The chief assumptions are the truth of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and, among Catholics, the validity of the claim of the Church to interpret them. The foregone conclusions may be summarized as the traditional creeds. At times philosophers have independently discussed theological problems, but no free scientific Theology has yet been established. In this region of research, the greatest need of to-day is perfect liberty to seek and proclaim the truth, unconcerned by the acquiescence or denial of the dignitaries of any ecclesiastical organization whatever. That granted, a clear understanding of the aim, scope, and methods of Theology is essential. Progress is much more rapid, results are much more accurate, and labour is reduced, if this latter demand is satisfied as fully as possible at the outset.

Every science is made up of propositions which are either directly descriptive or inferential. The former refer to immediate experiences; the latter are arrived at by a process of reasoning from the former. A science is thus a body of knowledge of such propositions, capable of growth by an increase in their number or their comprehension. The process of growth leading to differentiation and

greater complexity, the field of research ultimately becomes too large to be adequately investigated by any single individual, and special regions must be marked off for separate treatment. But this division of labour, although it leads to progress with reference to matters of detail, is likely to be detrimental to our understanding of experience unless it is supplemented by a careful consideration of the relation of the various studies to one another. The lack of a general consideration is one of the most marked features of present theological study. Yet all sciences should be systems more or less complete and consistent. Dependent upon experienced fact and the processes of reason their validity and value must be judged by experience and reason; and in this respect no difference is to be found between Theology and any other science.

The evolution of knowledge depends upon the relation of the individual to society and to history. A science is a social and a historical product: it challenges the individual's acceptance. In comparison with the results already embodied in the traditional systems the effort and achievement of any one man appear insignificant; over against his very limited experience they stand for the experience and reflexion of ages. Nevertheless, small as the contribution of the individual may be, it is only by his challenging past theory in the light of his own life and thought that knowledge progresses. By the patient work of individuals, co-operating with one another, the whole of organized science has been built up. To be a real possession this knowledge must be appropriated by the definite and conscious activity of the individual. Conflict arises and is generally most keen against tradition in matters of Theology, in which the interests of the religious society are concerned. To the individual it is personal conviction that counts: however much weight must be allowed to tradition it is for him to decide whether he will accept it unmodified or modified, or reject it entirely.

II.

A survey of Theology as a science will start with the question: What are the data of Theology? To this question no absolute and complete answer can be given. Like all other sciences it depends for its data upon experience, and as that for us is under the form of time, we are never justified in assuming that we may not meet in future with

data of greater importance than any yet known. To appreciate fully the significance of this truth is of particular importance in Theology, because many have contended that absolute and complete knowledge in this sphere is already possible of recognition. The existence of eternally valid truths, some of which may be already known to man, cannot be denied; but it must be insisted that such truths become known to men at particular points in time, and further, that no science is purely formal, but all depend to some extent upon the data of immediate experience. The data of Theology are obtained from religious experience, by which expression at the outset must be implied what is generally and popularly meant by religion. In the course of scientific investigation the use of the term should become more precise; but to give precision to the term is not one of the objects of the present paper.

What is the aim of Theology? In this, as in almost all studies, there is a search for a purely intellectual satisfaction which should not be underestimated. Nevertheless, the man who studies Theology merely as an intellectual pursuit arouses in us the feeling of insufficiency and poverty. The essential purpose of Theology is to gain an understanding of the religious life and its implications, and to raise it to higher levels through the purifying influence of critical reflexion. The most fruitful study of the subject starts out with the hope of making men more conscious of what religion means; it is not a mere intellectual curiosity, but a broadening of the outlook on life and a deepening of the feelings. The objection is sometimes raised, that if a man has the interests of religion at heart he will be prejudiced in his judgments as to the truth of religious doctrines. To such an objection many replies may be made. An opponent of religion would be just as liable to be prejudiced in his judgments. And, whatever an individual may think to the contrary, it is extremely difficult, if not entirely impossible, to be completely indifferent to the religious attitude. In his actual way of life, if not in his expressed conviction, every man is sympathetic or antagonistic to it: in religion it is true that he who is not with us is against us. To require that the man who studies Theology shall be conscious of its practical significance and shall be sympathetic towards the attitude with which his study is concerned is quite rational and justifiable. It would hardly be too

much to say that only the man who has religious experience of his own can really understand the subject-matter and the aim of Theology. Ask a blind man for an adequate treatment of colours and the science of light would be ludicrous. But all this is no reason for the student of Theology not to strive with all his power and with utmost sincerity to find the truth. The search for truth and its admission when found are, in fact, of the deepest essence of religion. But by religion is not to be understood the formal acquiescence in any specific body of doctrines.

Attention may now be turned to the consideration of the scope and methods of theological study. The first task is the description of the nature and the contents of the religious experience. This investigation is mainly analytical, and will refer to the individual and the social aspects of religious life: it may be appropriately called *The Psychology of Religion*. A survey of the religious life of the past, a simple indication from the standpoint of the theory of evolution of the stages through which individuals and societies have come to their religious beliefs and attitudes towards life, is the subject of *The History of Religion*. Allied with these two branches of research is that of *The Comparative Study of Religions*, the purpose of which is to differentiate the aspects of similarity and of difference in the various historical religions. All these sections of Theology are purely empirical, descriptive, and analytic: their task is simply to state what they find; it is not for them to enter upon critical comment as to the worth of the ideas and practices they describe. Hypotheses and theories as to the relationships between religious rites and beliefs, of different religions to one another and to experience in general, may indeed find a place here, but no question is raised as to the truth of the doctrines or the validity of the value-judgments contained in the religious consciousness. To this division of Theology might therefore be applied the term *The Empirical Study of Religion*.

The data thus obtained and systematized must then be submitted to critical examination, with the object of determining the truth and the value of the contents of the religious experience. Such critical examination is not an end in itself, but preparatory to constructive effort. Starting from the descriptive and inferential propositions which are judged valid among those obtained in the

Empirical Study of Religion, the constructive theologian must endeavour to formulate a consistent and comprehensive ideal of the religious life and of its implications. To this critical and synthetical study we give the name of *The Philosophy of Religion*. As such a realm of thought cannot be kept separate from our view of the world in general, the Philosophy of Religion must always bear a close relationship to Philosophy in its widest sense.

Some form of corporate activity and public worship appears to be an inseparable element of religion as found in history, and for the administration and organization of these forms of social expression there has usually been a definite religious ministry. The work of ministering to religious needs and endeavouring to raise men to higher stages of religious life forms a more or less distinct subject of study under the name of *Pastoral Theology*. Concerned with the psychological consideration of religious needs and their most appropriate and justifiable satisfaction, and with the forms most suitable for the expression and cultivation of the religious attitude and experience, it partakes of the nature of an applied science. In so far as it aims at the realization of the highest conception of religion expressed in the Philosophy of Religion, it forms a link between the Empirical Study and the Philosophy of Religion, between the religious life as it now is and what one strives to make it. On the other hand, the experience of pastors in their ministerial functions should lead to contributions to the Psychology of Religion.

The scope of Theology may therefore be outlined as follows :

THEOLOGY.

I. THE EMPIRICAL STUDY OF RELIGION. II. THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <i>a.</i> The Psychology of Religion (Analytic). | <i>a.</i> Critical (Examination of Empirical Data). |
| <i>b.</i> The History of Religion (Genetic). | <i>b.</i> Constructive (Formulation of Ideal System). |
| <i>c.</i> The Comparative Study of Religions. | |

III. PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

III.

The position indicated in the above outline of the aim, scope, and method of Theology may become more clear by a consideration of some probable objections and questions which it may

call forth. Could such a view find a place for Mysticism? One would suppose that what is truly mystical is as such inexplicable, even inexpressible, in theoretical terms. Intellectual expression implies a certain degree of rational comprehension, and challenges critical examination. The mystical element in life cannot be denied : in some form it is real in the experience of every one ; but it baffles explanation and theoretical description. Ultimate experiences must be admitted as such : unintelligible sentences do not aid us in realizing any deeper truth in them. How ideas first originate in men's minds is a mystery, and some may come in the experiences of mystics ; but it has not yet been shown that the truth or the validity of an idea is at all affected by the nature of its origin. All conceptions which claim a place in Theology must be submitted to critical examination. To argue, as some writers have recently done, that man needs the mystical, and then to label certain doctrines mystical, is not a valid method of removing them from the test of truth. The *raison d'être* of theological creeds is that they give a meaning to and indicate a value in life which otherwise it would not appear to have ; it is just in so far as they make man's existence more intelligible than it would be without them that they are of importance. The truly mystical commences where thought is inadequate—in a realm beyond ideas and theoretical expression. What passes as Mysticism is often nothing else but the ordinary theological doctrines expressed with fervour and strong religious emotion. The writings of the mystics will provide a considerable amount of material for psychological investigation and philosophical reflexion, but apart from their intrinsic religious worth thus found, they cannot rightly be regarded as possessing any especially authoritative character of their own. As a stimulus to the feelings, in private and public worship, the importance of mystical and devotional literature cannot be overestimated.

The proposed scheme of Theology omits specific reference to several studies which are usually regarded as falling within its sphere. These are in the main concerned with philological questions and must be carried on in accordance with the general principles and methods of philology. The study of the books of the Old and the New Testaments in the original must conform to the same standards as the study of any other writings

'sacred' or 'profane.' This is now generally admitted amongst scholars, but in practice these philological researches are far too often influenced by previously formed theological views, and the possible bearing of the philological conclusion upon Theology is allowed to determine the attitude to important questions. For the Empirical Study of Religion it is necessary to find the real significance of the Scriptures, but there is no adequate reason that our religious beliefs shall be identical with those therein contained. Philological questions are the task of philological scholars: theological students should seek essentially to understand the nature and the requirements of the religious life.

Comment may be made in more conservative circles upon the fact that we have not recognized the distinction usually made between Natural and Revealed Religion, a distinction often thought to be fundamental for Theology. To the thought of to-day, as contrasted with that of the eighteenth century, this distinction is really little more than a verbal one. All knowledge is in some sense natural and all in some sense revealed. The object known, whether material or spiritual, human or divine, is known only because it stands in an active relationship with the mind that knows. The mind never experiences a purely passive object: it knows only because its activity meets with some resistance. In thought which is true, man does not think just what he wishes but what he must; what the nature of reality compels him to think. It is the same with regard to the knowledge of the spiritual as it is of that of the material world. All religious experience, if valid, and not simply transitory subjective feeling, is in the end a relationship between active beings. God revealing Himself to men is God in active relation with men. Religious knowledge from the side of man is natural, and from the side of God is revealed. This revelation takes many forms—through the religious feelings which Nature arouses in us, and more especially through the history and the moral and the religious consciousness of humanity. Religion is now admitted as a normal characteristic of human life, and whatever its apparent immediate source, all genuine religion is ultimately a fellowship between the individual in his social condition and the divine; so that all Theology is in this sense natural.

In the place of the above discussed distinction

modern thought insists upon that between the knowledge of God obtained through external nature on the one hand, and that obtained through the moral and spiritual life of man on the other. And, as in earlier times Revealed Religion was thought of as superior to Natural Religion, so now the knowledge of God which comes through human moral and religious experience is held to transcend that derived from the world of nature. For Revealed Religion the central point was the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and modern Theology still finds itself forced to admit that He is the greatest religious personality of the race, and that in His life and teaching He is supreme in the revelation of the divine amongst men.

It may also be asked in what manner the term 'Christian Theology' might be used. Christian Theology is a definite portion of Theology. For data it has the religious experience of Christians, and in this, most especially, all that has been felt and thought of Jesus Christ. It will trace the history of Christianity, and will critically examine its doctrines and practices in the endeavour to present in its best form the religious outlook of the Christian faith. Scientific Theology cannot admit *a priori* any superiority of worth in the Christian view of life: examination may show that it has truth and value not to be found in any other religion; but this may not be assumed at the outset. As a religion and as an implicated Theology, Christianity must establish its precedence before the bar of rational reflexion and the moral and religious consciousness. But it cannot be adequately understood and appreciated apart from the general History of Religion, and Theology cannot consider it as other than a distinct type of religious life, and therefore as a subject of examination under all the sections of the proposed scheme.

In the immediate future it seems probable that men generally will make a distinction, though not with full consciousness, between Christian Theology and the Theology of Jesus. The Synoptic Gospels give as a general impression a picture of Jesus of Nazareth which still makes a very strong appeal to all sorts and conditions of men. The doctrines which the Church has developed concerning Him often fail to attract even where they do not arouse actual opposition. For a life of religious experience such as that of Jesus, it will be urged that no other Theology than His is

needed. A man may say: The religious attitude of Jesus and His disciples so appeals to me that on the authority of this appeal and the influence of His character, I accept for my own life the fundamental religious doctrines which He held. Some of the traits in the personality and some of the elements in the teaching, as, *e.g.*, the merely eschatological ones, he will put down to temporary and transitory causes, and will discard them. But the essential attitude of Jesus Himself, as distinct from what are obviously the statements of others about Him, he will adopt as his own attitude. The theological student may find difficulties in the position; but to the masses of mankind it will present a simple creed, higher than which they have not been given and sanctified by a personality and a life which never lose their charm or authority.

IV.

Of the many questions that might still be raised two only can be referred to in the present paper. At the outset of this discussion the claim for absolute freedom in theological research was made. Except among a few scholars attached to free religious bodies, such freedom has never existed in the Christian Churches in the past, and it does not exist to-day. Almost all theological students—including most Professors of Divinity—are officially attached to ecclesiastical organizations, to hold any position in which subscription to specific statements of doctrine is demanded. Even where some liberty of interpretation is allowed, prevailing circumstances lead thinkers to turn their attention to subjects less likely to cause discussion, or to express themselves in a manner which hides their position from all but the theological expert. What is required for advance in Theology is the same as has been demanded for other sciences in the past: the main activities of men under no restriction whatever as to the methods of their investigation, the sources of their data, and the statements of their results. If it is not possible that such scholars should be attached officially to definite religious bodies, other provision should be made for them, just as for any other branch of study in a university. Faculties of Theology should be quite free, and in the interest of thought and religion itself no one should be allowed to occupy a Chair of Divinity who holds any position which requires definite adherence to prescribed doctrines. If the

various ecclesiastical bodies desire to give theological instruction on their own peculiar principles, that is essentially a concern of their own, but if—as we believe—it is becoming generally recognized that the possession of religious truth is of at least as much importance as that of ethics, history, and such branches of knowledge, there should be provision for its untrammelled investigation. The cause of religion demands it. Upon liberty of theological thought depends ultimately the question of religious reunion; for truth is one, and will make men free from the errors and trivialities which divide them. It is hardly possible to overestimate the power which a united Christendom—or even a united Protestantism—would have in the world; and yet reunion is directly prevented by the demands made of religious ministers, which hinder their search for and statement of truth.

This subject cannot be left without some reference to the training of candidates for the religious ministry. Assuming in the first place a sound general education, it has never to be lost sight of, that the purpose of the training is not to produce theologians, but to equip men for the particular occupation of *ministering* to the religious *life*. The theological course therefore should be the widest possible, including the three sections, the Empirical Study of Religion, the Philosophy of Religion, and Pastoral Theology. Far too much time is spent in most of our theological colleges and divinity halls in philological studies, which have not even a secondary value for the ministerial office; and an entirely wrong sense of proportion is thus cultivated at a most important time in the minister's life. Considering the education of its ministers, it says much for the vitality of the Christian religion that it has achieved the success which it has already met with; and if present-day Christians would give themselves up whole-heartedly to the pursuit of truth, the whole world might be won over to it.

Yet, however wide the range of theological study, it is in itself inadequate for the training of the pastor, whose task is to endeavour to satisfy spiritual needs. However reverently presented, scientific Theology is still essentially theoretical, and here more is required. The fervour of the religious geniuses of the race must be felt: the spirit of the saints of the past must be entered into by a quiet and regular perusal of the devotional and mystical literature of ages which are gone.

Further, a consideration of the moral and religious problems of contemporary life is, one would suppose, an essential factor in a minister's training; but it is almost universally neglected.

A religious body is primarily a society of persons united to live the religious life. In and for this life ideas and beliefs are necessary. But although individual and often quite opposed religious bodies have made the claim to be especially and uniquely guided by God in their practices and beliefs, there seems to be no reliable evidence to justify the claim. Nevertheless, a Church as a teaching institution must have something definite to teach, and the learner must in the first place receive his

instruction on authority. Dogmatic instruction does not, however, constitute the most important part of education, whether religious or secular; the pupil requires also to learn how to test for himself so-called knowledge, and how to acquire new experience. Of more importance than the acquiescence in certain formulations of religious conceptions is the cultivation of the attitude of honesty and sincerity in the search for religious truth. And if the sheep of the flock are ever to determine their lives on this principle, it must first be conformed to by the shepherds, and by none more than by those who occupy themselves with the scientific study of Theology.

In the Study.

A Study in Christian Experience.

BY REV. JAMES H. HODSON, B.D., LYTHAM.

'The Spirit and the flesh.'—Gal 5¹⁶⁻²⁵.

THE central theme of this great passage in the Epistle to the Galatians is the conflict waged in the believer's heart between the Spirit of God and the flesh (v.¹⁷). The strife differs from that described in Ro 7, which depicts the experience of St. Paul whilst still 'carnal' (v.¹⁴). The former passage refers to the Spirit-led life; the latter to the self-controlled one. It is only as we contrast these two passages that the real meaning and glory of the Christian experience portrayed in Galatians become manifest. Our purpose is to attempt to set forth this contrast in its salient features.

I. THE COMBATANTS.

In Gal 5¹⁶⁻²⁵ these are the 'Spirit,' *i.e.* the Holy Ghost indwelling the regenerate soul, and 'the flesh,' *i.e.* the principle of sin in man's fallen nature. This evil principle sometimes shows its 'works' or 'doings' in sins connected with the body, 'fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, drunkenness, revellings' (vv.^{19, 21}), and as this type of sin is the more obvious it gives the name of 'flesh' to the evil bias. But the sinful inclination is also shown in evils connected with the intellect, as 'idolatry, sorcery, factions, divisions, heresies,' or with the emotions, as 'enmities, strife, jealousies,

wraths, envyings' (vv.^{20, 21}). The 'flesh' is in direct antagonism to the Divine Spirit, as is the 'Spirit' to 'the flesh' (v.¹⁷): 'the mind of the flesh is enmity against God' (Ro 8⁷). This duel may go on even in the regenerate nature as is presupposed in the passage before us, for it is addressed to those who are 'sons' of God (4⁶). That this inner strife is a reality God's children know only too well (1 Jn 1⁸): in their new life they find both peace and war.

'In every soul that shall be saved is a Godly Will that never assented to sin, nor ever shall. Right as there is a beastly will in the lower part that may will no good, right so there is a Godly Will in the higher part, which will is so good that it may never will evil, but ever good.'—JULIAN OF NORWICH, *Revelations of Divine Love*, 1373 A.D.

'As to the habitual temper of my mind I find a principle within me opposing and striving against indwelling corruption and sin of all kinds.'—SARAH GILCHRIST in *Revivals of the Eighteenth Century*.

'In referring to one of his brother's hymns in which occur the words, "I wrestle not now, but trample on sin," John Wesley remarked, "So says my brother, but not I."—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, March 1913.

In Ro 7 the contending forces in this conflict are different: on one side is 'the inward man' (v.²²), or the real self, the 'I' (v.¹⁷), or 'the law of my mind' (v.²³); and on the other, 'sin which dwelleth in me' (v.¹⁷), or 'the law of sin which is in my members' (v.²³). Thus the combatants here are the higher nature which links us to God,

which, speaking generally, we may call conscience, and the lower nature which is the seat of sinful and sensual passions. The higher nature delights in the law of God (v.²²) and would fain serve it (v.²⁵), but the lower nature binds the 'wretched man' in captivity to sin (v.²³). In one sense the aspiration of the higher nature towards good is the work of the Spirit of God, who is the Author of 'every virtue we possess.' To follow our highest intuitions is to be 'led of the Spirit.' But here His operation is rather that of the Spirit who convicts 'in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgement' (Jn 16⁸), working upon the heart, than that of the Spirit welcomed into the heart as an Almighty Ally, as a regenerating force. What the apostle depicts as his own experience has been felt by universal man, who has ever had to confess that seeing the right he yet does the wrong. It is specifically the experience of a man who is under conviction of his guilt and is penitent, but who has not learned the evangelical secret of victory. As between the combatants here described the strife is unequal, and can only end in defeat. Of itself the 'mind' is often unable to discern the right, and when it sees the true course is easily swayed by passion or self-interest to palliate the evil. If it cannot thus deceive itself it is inherently feeble and quickly pulled down into the slime of sin. The conflict is between a giant and a dwarf. But when, as in the case described in Gal 5, we 'live by the Spirit' (v.²⁵), when 'the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus' has made us 'free from the law of sin and of death' (Ro 8²), all the advantage is on our side as we fight against the 'flesh.' Then we are 'strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man' (Eph 3¹⁶). Our sinful nature is brought face to face with God as its antagonist. Reinforced by Almighty power we are more than conquerors. Sure of deliverance from sin's thralldom we cry triumphantly, 'I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord' (Ro 7²⁵).

II. THE CONFLICT.

As we have already seen, the 'flesh' is the dominant force in the spiritual duel described in Ro 7: the higher nature is 'sold under sin' (v.¹⁴); the better self is even compelled to do what it hates (v.¹⁵); sin reigns in the soul. The truth of this account is seen luridly in the lives of wicked men, but it is also a fact that sin has dominion in

every unrenewed heart, either as ingratitude to a loving God, or as selfishness towards man, or as impotence for holiness: self is the master-passion.

'I experienced within me as the conflict of two armies—the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh. Even when my lusts had been subdued, so as to seem trampled under foot, I found them stealing upon me anew, and drawing away my heart from God and from matters of duty. . . . I discovered in me a lusting after things sinful which I had not power to overcome. I became persuaded that unless the Lord would undertake for me, and work all my works in me and for me, I would not succeed in doing anything to purpose.'—ELIZABETH DYKES in *Revivals of the Eighteenth Century*.

But in the conflict set forth in Gal 5 the 'flesh' is no longer regnant: its 'dominion' is ended; it has been 'crucified with the passions and lusts thereof' (v.²⁴).

'Christ was crucified in the likeness of sinful flesh: "they that are Christ's" crucify the very reality. It was the first act of their new and regenerate life. They deliberately, thoughtfully, thankfully delivered to death the remainder of their evil. Every Christian must have his own Calvary, his own cross set up in the secret shrine of the soul, and crucify there, and keep crucified until crucifixion ends in death, all that belongs to his flesh with 'its affections and lusts.'—W. B. POPE, D.D.

How great the contrast between the 'flesh' as reigning and the 'flesh' as crucified! How crippled its baleful power! Doubtless it makes many efforts to wrench its limbs from the cross and to come down to regain its sway over the believer. He is conscious of its writhings, and needs to put out his strength to keep it fixed on the cross. The cravings of the sensual 'lusts' are only tamed by stern measures. 'It is a greater labour to resist vices and passions than to toil at bodily labours' (A'KEMPIS). But the more subtle 'affections' of the 'flesh,' its pride, its wilfulness, its rebellion against chastisement, its self-seeking, are only excised by a keen knife that goes near to life itself.

General Gordon was requested to go to the Soudan, much against his will, as he was in conversation with a friend. A look of anger passed quite visibly over his face. On recovering himself he said to his friend, 'That was self, which I am daily trying to kill.'

Despite the severity of the struggle, the 'flesh' cannot prevail over the child of God, for the power which binds it is that of the Holy Spirit. True self-mortification is really the operation of the indwelling Spirit of God.

'Though we have crucified our flesh to keep it bound to the cross, it is not the rigour of our ascetic severity that destroys "the body of sin." It is the breath of the Holy Ghost which withers the fruits of evil in our nature; and it is His condemning word that blights the tree of evil in us unto its root. We must not doubt that He will finish in this life the work He has begun in us. The Holy Ghost, we may hope, will cry over our crucified flesh, with all its affections and lusts stilled and extinguished for ever, "It is finished."—W. B. POPE, D.D.

III. THE CONDITIONS.

There is a glorious change in the atmosphere in which the inward conflict is carried on before and after the soul's acceptance of the sanctifying Spirit. The difference is in regard to the soul's relation to 'the law.' In Ro 7 the soul, prior to its discharge (v.⁶), is under the 'dominion' of the law, 'holden' in bondage by it (v.⁶), condemned to death by it (vv.⁹⁻¹¹). The better nature tries to order life by the law, to meet its demands, only to discover its own powerlessness and to incur the inevitable penalty (v.¹⁰; Gal 3¹⁰⁻¹²). The interior strife is waged amid deep gloom, until there is conscious emancipation from the law.

'After the unforgiven sinner has done his utmost he feels that he has not fulfilled that law of God which is so straight, and so unbending just because it must be straight. Climb as he may the height of perfection he sees the summit rising still above him, wrapped in darkness and lurid with flame. After he has made some great exertion he looks to the law to see if it will give him a smile of approbation, and he beholds only a darkening frown upon its face.'—DR. M'COSH, *Method of the Divine Government*.

'By my continued endeavour to keep His whole law, inward and outward, to the utmost of my power, I was persuaded that I should be accepted of Him and that I was even then in a state of salvation. . . . I diligently strove against all sin. I omitted no sort of self-denial which I thought lawful. I carefully used both in public and private all the means of grace at all opportunities; I omitted no occasion of doing good. All this I knew to be nothing, unless it was directed towards inward holiness. Yet when, after continuing some years in this course I apprehended myself to be near death, I could not find that all this gave me any comfort or any assurance of acceptance with God. At this I was then not a little surprised, not imagining I had been all this time building on the sand.'—J. Wesley's *Journal*, vol. i. p. 468, Stand. ed.

But subsequent to the new life in the Spirit the inner battle is fought under a sunny sky. The believer is 'not now under the law' (Gal 5¹⁸): he does right not because he must, but because it is his joy to do God's will; he is not driven by external commands but 'led by the Spirit' (v.¹⁸);

he obeys God out of the spontaneous impulse of a loving heart. God's statutes become his songs. Thus practising the virtues of the new life in Christ he can have no sense of God's displeasure: against the graces of the Spirit 'there is no law' (v.²³); there can be no Divine disapproval of a holy life, and so he is habitually conscious of God's smile. Should any shadow at the memory of his past sin, any inadvertent lapse at the present, cloud the heavens, he penitently remembers that 'there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus' (Ro 8¹⁻²). How much easier it is now to fight the good fight of faith! The debt of unforgiven sin lifted from his conscience, the hitherto impossible task turned into an 'easy yoke,' he girds himself for every struggle with inbred sin conscious of his new resources in the Spirit, and joyful in the hope of complete victory: he is a 'happy warrior.'

IV. THE CONQUEST.

The issue of the unequal strife in Ro 7 is the defeat of the higher nature, of the nobler intuitions. This is frankly confessed (vv.^{15, 18, 19}). With clear views of the folly of sin the penitent still commits it. He is carried down the tide against his desire and convictions. 'To-day he weeps over his sins, and, before he is aware of it, he is rejoicing in iniquity to-morrow. In a brief excitement he rises a little above his habitual level of earthliness, but he cannot soar to the heavenly regions of purity and peace: if he seek, Icarus-like, to mount by earthly means, his flight may only make his fall the more lamentable: his carnal thoughts and feelings, like noxious weeds, cut down in one quarter, speedily spring up in another' (DR. M'COSH). At last the cry is wrung from his weary heart: 'O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?' (Ro 7²⁴).

'In this vile, abject state of bondage to sin I was indeed fighting continually, but not conquering. Before, I had willingly served sin: now it was unwillingly; but still I served it. I fell, and rose, and fell again. Sometimes I was overcome, and in heaviness: sometimes I overcame, and was in joy.'—John Wesley's *Journal*, vol. i. p. 476, Stand. ed.

'When Henry Reed realized his wonderful escape from death he wept with gratitude to God, and solemnly vowed that from that moment he would be a Christian. He threw his brandy bottle and pack of cards into the sea, and made a public declaration that he would henceforth live to God. He exerted all his will-power, depending on his own strength

of purpose, and did his best. But he soon found that sin was deeply seated in his inner being and held him in bondage, so that the evil he would not was just the thing he did.—*Autobiography of William Taylor of California.*

In his ballad entitled 'Cells,' Kipling describes the lamentation of a soldier imprisoned for drunkenness, and penitent enough. Outside are his weeping wife and child, but the drink-lust is on him, and in his heart he owns, 'I know I'll do it again!'

The conflict portrayed in Gal 5¹⁶⁻²⁵ is one of habitual victory over evil. Walking 'by the Spirit' the regenerate man does 'not fulfil the lust of the flesh' (v.¹⁶). The purpose of 'the flesh' is that he 'may not' (R.V. v.¹⁷) do the things that he 'cannot' as prompted by the Spirit. There is no 'cannot' in the case as in A.V. On the contrary, indwelt by the Spirit, he 'can do all things in him that strengtheneth' him (Ph 4¹³). '*When we were in the flesh*, the sinful passions, which were through the law, wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But *now* we have been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were holden: so that we *serve in newness of the spirit*' (Ro 7^{5, 6}).

'I was much buffeted with temptations; but cried out, and they fled away. They returned again and again. I as often lifted up my eyes, and He "sent me help from His holy place." And herein I found the difference between this and my former state chiefly consisted. I was striving, yea, fighting with all my might under the law, as well as under grace. But then I was sometimes, if not often, conquered. Now, I was always conqueror.'—*John Wesley's Journal*, vol. i. p. 477, Stand. ed.

'I was, however, enabled to look to the Lord in faith for grace to conquer these strong lusts and corruptions, and as I thus looked to Him I became stronger, and they became weaker.'—E. DYKES in *Revivals of the Eighteenth Century*.

'Thou holdest my soul In spiritual life,
My foes dost control, And quiet their strife:
Thou rulest my passion, My pride and self-will;
To see Thy salvation, Thou bidd'st me "Stand still!"'
CHARLES or JOHN WESLEY.

V. THE SECRET OF VICTORY OVER SIN.

The source of spiritual triumph implied throughout Gal 5¹⁶⁻²⁵ is clearly revealed in the injunction—'Walk by the Spirit' (vv.^{16, 25}). 'We live by the Spirit': our spiritual life depends on Him as our physical life does on the air. It is as we are inspired, guided, filled, 'by the Spirit' that we overcome every influence of 'the flesh' (Ro 8²). We walk 'by the Spirit' in the proportion in which we 'walk by faith,' i.e. 'utter dependence

upon the life-communicating Christ.' Such faith, as at the beginning of the Christian life, is the required thing to its close. 'The faith which works conversion accomplishes sanctification' (H. W. CLARK, D.D.). Oneness of our life with Christ's through His Spirit by faith is the only source of abiding Christ-likeness. It cannot be otherwise. It is suggested by the apostle (Gal 6¹⁴) that the believer's conquest of the internal enemy 'the flesh' may be extended to a triumph over the external one 'the world': there is possible such a mutual crucifixion, 'the world unto me, and I unto the world,' that no intercommunion can take place! Such complete victory is distinctly ascribed to faith (1 Jn 5^{4, 5}).

'A sincere spirit of legalism, more than anything else prevented the Holy Spirit from perfecting that which was lacking in my faith. It was not theoretical but practical legalism. I did not for a moment trust to anything I had done, but under cover of vows and covenants to be holy I was really trusting in what I was going to do. . . . I worked myself nearly to death trying to be holy. In August 1845, on my way to a camp-meeting I saw that . . . I should pay no particular attention to my emotional sensibilities nor to their changes . . . but should simply accept the Bible record of God's provisions and promises as an adequate basis of faith . . . and receive and trust the Divine Saviour for all that He had come to do for me, and nothing less. I was then and there enabled to establish two essential facts: (1) to be true to Jesus Christ; (2) to receive and trust Him to be true to me. So there, on my horse in the road, I began to say more emphatically than ever before "I belong to God. Every fibre of my being I consecrate to Him. I consent to perfect obedience. I have no power to do anything towards saving myself, but in utter helplessness I receive and trust Jesus for full salvation." I went on, maintaining my two facts as the Lord gave me power to do, without the aid of joyous feeling. One evening at the meeting I said to a saintly woman, "In the years of my unbelief and apostasy I acquired such a habit of doubting that I have never been able fully to conquer it." Instantly the taunt of the tempter rang through the domain of my spirit-nature: "Can't! you can't do it!" I saw I had inadvertently made a concession which Satan was using to defeat my faith: I said to her, "God commands us to believe and be saved. He does not command impossibilities; so I have said, "I can't believe" for the last time. I can do whatsoever He commands, for He hath said, "My grace is sufficient for thee." I at once revised my spiritual vocabulary and ignored all the "can'ts," "ifs," "buts," in regard to the grand possibilities of the grace of God. That was a victory for my faith, but I felt no cleansing power within. One sleepless night in a moment the oft-repeated fact went through me like an electric shock, "With God all things are possible." I rested my weary soul on the bosom of Jesus, and saw spread out before me an ocean of available soul-saving resources in God, and overheard the whispers of the Holy Spirit, "Jesus saves you; He saves you now." I was fully

united to Him in the bonds of mutual fidelity, confidence, and love. I have from that day to this dwelt with Jesus, and verified the truth of the record of God concerning His Son.'—*Autobiography of William Taylor of California.*

When the soul is thus made free from the control of inbred sin the ground is cleared for the growth of 'fruit unto holiness' (Ro 6²²). The lusts of the flesh, which, like thorns, choked the good seed, are rooted up. Beneath His gentle, vivifying influences 'the fruit of the Spirit' (Gal 5^{22, 23}), lovingly, faithfully tended, grows apace in the cleansed heart, even a hundredfold, to the glory of the abounding grace of God.

'O God, deliver us from earthly desires, that no sin may reign in us, but that we may with free spirits serve Thee, our only Lord: through Jesus Christ. Amen.'—*Gelasian Sacramentary*, 492 A.D.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

June Evenings.

'In the cool of the day.'—Gn 3⁸.

I wonder what part of the day you, boys and girls, like best, in this lovely month of June. I knew a little girl who went to spend a June afternoon and evening at the home of one of her companions. They played about the garden, enjoying themselves amongst the flowers. The time slipped past very quickly: my little friend could scarcely believe her ears when she heard ten o'clock strike. It was still daylight, and not a breath of wind was blowing. 'How lovely,' she said to herself; 'this is the time of year I like best. Think of being out till past bed-time.'

That was only a little girl speaking; but I believe that many old men, and old women, and grown-up young people as well, have loved summer evenings. The writer of Genesis loved them. Read his stories, and you will discover this for yourselves. He must have been a learned man with a beautiful mind; and when he wrote this wonderful book I do not think he could have been very old.

Isaac, he tells us, went out to meditate *at evening-tide*. If Isaac had lived in the days of our fathers or grandfathers, I believe we should have had volumes upon volumes of his poetry. There is no time one feels the fragrance of field flowers more than on an evening in early summer. You know the scent that a clover field has then, do you not? I would not venture to say that there were

clover fields where Isaac took his evening walk; but when he was old and blind, receiving savoury meat, such as he loved, from the hands of Jacob, he blessed him, and said:

See, the smell of my son

Is as the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed.

And do you remember another Genesis story that tells of an evening scene at a well? It is in my mind like a picture. A beautiful young woman comes to draw water. She meets an old man at the well, to whom she gives drink; she draws water for his camels also. Then he presents her with ear-rings and bracelets. When she took the old man to her home, she discovered that it was not a mere matter of getting presents, it was a story with God in it. You know it, don't you?

Then take your text. God Himself walked in the garden *in the cool of the day*. Many of you have, I daresay, been in some of the lovely Botanic Gardens of our big cities, or better still in the wide country on a June evening. Wasn't there a wonderful stillness about? You could hear the birds singing here and there, but very softly; even the friend beside you was more silent than usual. That was the sort of evening the writer of Genesis knew, but with this difference—there was a slight, a very slight breeze blowing. He pictured the Garden of Eden for us as a place of perfect happiness, because there was no doing what was wrong in it—there was no sin; and the Lord God Himself walked there in the cool of the day.

I believe that we in this country have even more beautiful evenings, than the people who live where the Garden of Eden is supposed to have been. They are nearly always cool, and we can go out and enjoy them when there is not a breath of wind. But the picture of Eden's perfect happiness is one I want you all to remember. A lady friend told me of having spent her summer holidays in Morayshire in the north of Scotland. 'The evenings were almost too good to be true,' she said. She went on to tell me of one in particular, and quoted:

'Twas like an eve in a sinless world.'

I wonder if any of you bigger boys or girls could find out for me where those words were taken from. Try; and if you are successful, send the name of the author or authoress to me.

I scarcely think any of us value that glimpse of the Garden of Eden as we ought to. God is good in letting us have it. As I said, what made the happiness of Eden perfect was the fact that those who lived there had hearts without sin. But God's goodness and love followed Adam and Eve when they were driven out of Paradise. There was still the cool of the evening. My boys and girls, I have known a poor woman in Edinburgh (a really poor woman remember—she did not know where her next shilling was to come from) say a little prayer to her Heavenly Father, because He had made her home in such a fair city. It is 'beautiful for situation,' and like the June evenings in Morayshire, those of Edinburgh seem almost too good to be real.

If we have clean hearts, boys and girls—and you know where to get them—we can be very very happy in this world.

Here are a few verses about the Maker of it:

God made the country,
Man made the town,
God clad the country
In a green gown.

Poor folks from Eden
Driven away,
God made the country
For a holiday.

God gave the country
A flower, a bird,
To comfort His children
For the flaming sword.

For easing and pleasing
He made a tree,
Many a sweet rivulet,
Dew and the bee.

God made the country,
Man made the town,
Is not God a maker
Of great renown.¹

And on these lovely summer evenings, you may still have Him walking beside you as your friend.

II.

Paul Do-a-Thing.

BY THE REV. J. S. MAVER, M.A., PAISLEY.

'This one thing I do.'—Ph 3¹³.

A curious mistake was made at the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance which met in Aberdeen some time

¹ K. Tynan, *Irish Poems*.

ago. The Rev. Dr. Burrell of New York, the President, wishing no doubt to have some local colour in his opening address, some local reference that might add to its interest, had been searching the annals of Aberdeen, and had come across something which he thought might be suitable. He said, 'In the archives of the Royal Burgh of Aberdeen mention is made of a certain David Anderson, who lived in the seventeenth century, who had much to do with making it an enterprising and well-built town. Its churches, factories, fisheries, public markets, and seats of learning, he had a hand in them all. And because of that busy hand he came to be familiarly known as Davie Do-ä-thing.' And the speaker went on to say, 'Would that the spirit of Davie Do-ä-thing might appear in this Council, urging us to undertake great things for God and to expect great things from Him.'

Well, it was a very appropriate application of the reference in that sense, but a smile came over the faces of some of his hearers—the Scotchmen amongst them—for they recognized at once that he had made a slight mistake—a slight mistake in the accent—but one that implied a considerable difference in meaning from that which he had brought out. They saw that the real pronunciation was not Davie Do-ä-thing but Davie Do-ä'-thing. Dr. Burrell in his ignorance of Scotch had interpreted it wrongly. The name had not been given altogether in the way of praise, but had been applied by his fellow-citizens in a kind of amusing, and possibly somewhat contemptuous sense, to a man who had been noted for having his finger in every pie, so to speak.

But I think we might truly apply the phrase in both ways to St. Paul, though in his case both in a good sense. He was Paul Do-ä-thing, and he was also in a remarkable way Paul Do-ä'-thing—all things. In the following chapter of this Epistle he says, 'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.' Elsewhere he says, 'I am made all things to all men that I might by all means save some.' More than any other of the Apostles, Paul recognized the boundless scope of the Christian life, and the greatness of our possessions in Christ Jesus.

(1) Notice, first, the concentration in Paul's life, 'This one thing I do.' His was a very varied life, full of changes bright and sad. He was a great traveller, ever meeting new faces, fresh experiences,

working now at tent-making to pay his way and not be burdensome, again speaking to an assembly hanging upon his words, often facing an angry mob, in prison often. But throughout it all these words were true of him, 'This one thing I do.'

And that spirit of concentration applies to everything in life. It is true in business. Dr. Carnegie, who has been successful enough in that line, gives it as his opinion, founded on the observation of many years, that the failures of young business men are largely due to lack of concentration. If you dissipate your energies on a score of things, you are not likely to have much success in any of them. You will be like the man who has told that as a boy he was fond of music and wanted to be able to play every instrument. He tried the piano, harmonium, melodeon, violin, and flute, with the result, as he said, that, as a man, he can only play one instrument—the penny whistle. You must concentrate on one thing or another if you are ever to attain any measure of excellence.

Above all, in religion, if it is to bring us any real comfort and strength, it must be no half-hearted affair. Our heart must be truly in it, else it will only be a weary burden. It is no marvel that his Christianity should be the one thing in Paul's life when we know what it had done for him and how dear it was to him.

(2) But his was no narrow and meagre life in consequence of this one thing. It had been a poor and contracted kind of life in his pharisaic days, bigoted and prejudiced enough then. But he had been delivered from all that. He had been brought into a large place in Christ Jesus.

Speaking of Aberdeen, a place well known to me, there is a fund for the repair and upkeep of the Bridge of Don near the city—the new bridge, new at least as compared with the historic old bridge about a quarter of a mile away. This fund seems to have accumulated in the course of the years considerably beyond the needs of the bridge. The trustees of the fund wondered what they could do with some of the surplus money. They could not give it to any object outside the original purpose of the fund. They must use it within the limits of the trust. At last they solved the difficulty in an ingenious way by applying it to the repair not only of the bridge, but also of the *approaches* to the bridge. They put a generous interpretation upon the application of the fund, and yet one that still associated it with the bridge.

How much the term—the approaches to the bridge—includes at either end I am unable to say.

But is not that something like Paul's interpretation of his mission and message in the name of Jesus? And was it not the way in which Jesus Himself spake of all that was done for Him? 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.' That was a far-reaching approach to Him.

Mungo Park was seen one day throwing stones into the river Tweed. A friend who came upon him while thus employed said, 'That seems a poor occupation for one who has gone so far and done so much.' And then the great traveller explained, 'I was measuring,' said he, 'the depth by the time it took for the bubbles to come to the surface. I have found that very helpful many a time in my journeys.' So it was no mere purposeless waste of time in what seemed a childish occupation. There was method in it all. It had a meaning and a relationship to the main work of his life when understood in the right light. It was of a piece with the whole. In that sense he could have said with the apostle, 'This one thing I do.'

But there is nothing equal to the spirit of life in Christ for the wide and varied field of interest that may be embraced within its scope. Nothing is outside it that concerns human welfare. Paul's 'one thing' did not dwarf or starve his life in any way. His life had become rich in fellowship and friendship with all classes of people. He could write a charming letter to Philemon on behalf of a runaway slave. He had already won the heart of Philemon, the wealthy master, but none the less was he concerned about the forlorn creature who had come to him in his trouble. And even in emergencies, such as the shipwreck on his way to Rome, when all the others had lost their head, Paul stands out the one practical man among them, and through his presence of mind all were brought safely to land. In these, and in all the countless incidents of his widely varied life, Paul was ever acting up to his great motto, 'This one thing I do.'

Should we not learn from him something of the infinite scope of true religion and of the Master's service? We may live in heavenly places in the humblest spheres of life. There is a picture by a Dutch artist representing the interior of a kitchen, and the figure in the picture is that of an angel handling the pots and pans, and doing all the work

connected with the situation. It is not difficult to see what the artist intended to convey by his picture—that the high calling of God in Christ Jesus may be fulfilled in the commonest surroundings; that wherever our lot is cast, if the right spirit possess us, our service may be equal to that of the angels in the sight of the great Lord and Master of us all, and that, just as truly as the apostle in the greater sphere assigned to him, we may live up to the motto, ‘This one thing I do.’

III.

‘The Conscience Clock.’

BY THE REV. J. STRAHAN MCKEE, M.A., LONDON.

I wonder if you boys and girls read the newspapers. Perhaps some of you saw a little piece in the *Evening News* the other day about ‘The Clocks of London Bridge.’ This is at any rate what I read:

‘A man in khaki leisurely walking over London Bridge this morning looked at his watch and saw that it had stopped. He asked a passer-by what the time was, and got the reply, “Oh, about half-past ten.” Somewhat astonished he sought to get a glimpse of public clocks in the neighbourhood.

‘On a large insurance office was the face of a clock under hands; a few yards away another large clock said half-past two. He then glanced at a shop clock, which said twenty-minutes past seven. The clock outside the Canadian Pacific Company’s offices at the corner of King William Street stood at half-past six, and the London and Lancashire Assurance Company’s clock, a few doors away, made the time twelve o’clock, though whether midnight or midday was an open question.’

And lastly, and worst of all, ‘The hands of a church clock in Cannon Street pointed to ten minutes past ten. And as the fool in the forest said very sagely it was ten o’clock!’

What, I asked myself, could have happened to all these London clocks? Is this terrible war, as people say, really and truly putting back the hands of the clock? Or were they merely getting their annual spring-cleaning? I could not possibly tell. But one thing I do know, and that is that some boys, and girls too, set their own clocks wrong on purpose.

How, you ask, could they do this when they have not got such things as clocks which they can call their own? But I am sure they have! You

young people are very pleased, are you not, when you become the proud owners of watches, and cannot help taking them out of your pockets every five minutes to look at them. Well, boys and girls, our Heavenly Father has given to each one of us a splendid present of a clock which we carry about with us wherever we go. It is called a conscience. It does not say, Tick! Tock! Tick! Tock!—but, Yes! No! Yes! No! Right! Wrong! Right! Wrong! and if you do not treat it very well it stops.

Now there are three things about this most wonderful conscience clock that I would like you always to remember. You must do so if you want it to keep in order, for the works are very delicate.

Firstly, it is an eight-day clock. You know what that means? It must be wound up very carefully every eight days, if it is not to run down. I remember when I was a boy I held the very responsible position of winding up the dining-room clock every Sunday morning. I don’t think I ever forgot to do so. This is just what we have all come to church to do this Sunday morning. We pray and we sing to God. This is how we wind up our conscience clocks.

Secondly, it is a clock which needs to be regulated at certain times. It may go too fast or too slow. The dust that flies about in the streets and playfields and school-rooms may get into the inside. Easter, Christmas, or Communion Seasons are the best times to regulate our conscience clocks, that is, to find out what they have gained or lost. The Bible says, you know, ‘Let a man examine himself.’

Thirdly, it is an alarm clock. You will, perhaps, understand better what this means when you are a little older. Though some of you may have already heard the alarm. If one forgets about God and becomes careless and does many wicked deeds and falls asleep in sin, then some day, suddenly, the alarm rings out—‘Awake to righteousness, and sin not!’ God Himself sets the alarm to awaken us before it is too late.

Boys and girls, do learn to treat your conscience clocks well and they will keep good time and never stop, and God will be very pleased that you are so careful of His splendid gifts. Above all, never forget to do your best to keep them right to the minute by ‘looking unto Jesus’ every day of the week. He is always ready to help you to ‘get right with God’ if you but ask Him.

IV.

The King's Scout is the title of a small volume of addresses to children by the Rev. H. G. Tunnicliff, B.A. (Allenson; 1s. net). Each address is on some minor Old Testament personality. This is the address on

VASHTI.

In the far distant East, there once lived a mighty King. So powerful and all conquering was he, that his possessions stretched from India to Africa, and he even tried to conquer Greece.

In the third year of his reign, he decided to give a great feast to his subjects, and to let men see something of his riches and his generosity. To his palace he summoned all the citizens of the royal city, even the very poorest and humblest were invited, and for seven days they ate and drank as much as they pleased.

How delighted the citizens were at this magnificent treat! Everything around them awakened their wonder. The Court in which they gathered was hung with fine white and blue cloth, fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to rings of silver and great pillars of marble. The pavement was of white marble and alabaster, and stone of blue colour, and upon it all around were couches of pure gold and silver. When the guests were thirsty, they were given beautiful cups of gold from which to drink, each cup being of a different shape from any other.

Every one had a time of great enjoyment, and the praises of the great and generous King were sung by all.

But there was one great mistake that had been made in the arrangement of the feast. Wine was provided, and each could drink as much as he pleased. You can easily imagine what happened. All too soon men became intoxicated, and, worst of all, the great King himself failed to set a good example to his subjects. He who was such a brave general and strong ruler could not rule himself. On the very last day of the revels he took too much wine, and lost his senses. Whilst this feasting had been going on in the Court, the beautiful Queen had been giving entertainment to the women of the palace, and had not come out to join the others. In his drunken state, the King suddenly thought of her, and, as he was very proud of her, he decided to send for her, so that all his

princes and his people might see how stately and beautiful she looked in her royal robes and dazzling crown.

The Queen, however, had heard of all that was going on. She knew that many of the men were intoxicated, and she learned that the King was as bad as his people. Angry at his so forgetting the dignity of a monarch, and determined in her resolution to keep away from such a scene of drunkenness, she sent back the haughty answer that she would not obey the King. She well knew that her reply might cost her her life, for in those days kings were all-powerful, but she so hated the evils of intemperance, that she was ready to die rather than have anything to do with the drunken ruler.

When her message reached the King he boiled with rage. Never before had any one dared to disobey him. The men around him trembled at his anger, not knowing upon whom his wrath might fall.

'How shall we punish her?' demanded the King.

Anxious to please and pacify him, one of his courtiers suggested that the King should send out a proclamation that the disobedient Queen should lose her position and be driven out of the royal palace. Had the King been sober, he might have realized the reasonableness of his Queen's refusal, and not have been so ready to punish her. In his half-dazed state, however, he thundered out that it was the very best advice that he could have received, and he sent a messenger at once to that part of the palace where the Queen lived, that her crown and her robes were to be taken from her, for she was no longer his Queen. Dressed in simple clothes, on foot, and without any attendants, she, who had enjoyed all the splendours of the Court, slipped quietly away from the palace, poor so far as outward circumstances went, but rich, because she had done her duty, and still retained the greatest of all possessions—the testimony of a good conscience.

Remember the two lessons of this story. The awful evil of intemperance, and the supreme value of 'a conscience void of offence toward God and men.'

The drunken King was Ahasuerus (in your ancient history you will come across him under his familiar name of Xerxes), and the fearless Queen, whose character is so worthy of our imitation, was named Vashti. You will find the story in the first chapter of the Book of Esther.

Jesus upon 'Stumbling-blocks.'

BY THE REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.LITT., YATES PROFESSOR OF GREEK AND
NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Two things, Jesus taught, were impossible: that the sin against the Holy Spirit could be forgiven, and that 'stumbling-blocks' (σκάνδαλα) could be avoided altogether in human intercourse. The unpardonable sin has arrested the attention of the Church, sometimes to very little profit. But the exceptional severity of the teaching of Jesus upon σκάνδαλα has not always impressed the Christian conscience; it is one of the points at which the ethical emphasis of the gospel has been repeatedly missed. To some extent this has been the result of passing from one language to another. In a recent issue of this magazine (pp. 331-332), Professor Moulton has raised the problem of the etymology of the Greek term, in view of a forthcoming attempt by Archdeacon Allen to establish 'snare' or 'trap' as the proper meaning of σκάνδαλον. I shall be interested to see if any fresh arguments can be added to those which Mr. Carr brought forward in his paper (*Expositor*, 5th ser., vol. viii. p. 344 f.). Not long ago I had occasion to look into this problem, and I confess the evidence for this interpretation of σκάνδαλον and σκανδαλίζειν did not appear cogent, so far as the N.T. was concerned. It is unfortunate that the other sense has no strict or satisfactory equivalent in our language. 'Stumbling-block' is less misleading than 'offence,' but it has no verb, and it hardly conveys to a modern reader what the Greek word carried home to a primitive Christian. Even a rendering like 'hindrance' is too weak. But what I wish to urge in this paper is rather the passion and intensity with which the words of Jesus on this matter are always charged. Whatever the etymology of the Greek term may be, there is no doubt as to the ethical verdict of Jesus upon those who proved σκάνδαλα to other people. One of the very sternest sayings in the Gospels flashed from His lips at the thought of this sin, and every word about σκάνδαλον and σκανδαλίζειν thrills with an acute sense of danger to the soul. I am afraid that the rather conventional associations of the English words 'offend' and 'offence' have been partly responsible for the fact that many readers of the N.T. do not realize the tremendous severity of what Jesus said

about 'stumbling-blocks.' It is true, of course, as any student of patristic literature and interpretation knows, that this evaporation began at an early period, even when Greek was the language of the Church. Chrysostom, for example, took σκάνδαλον in Mt 18⁷ to mean ἡ ἕβρις. 'Do not be surprised,' he added, 'at this, for many τῶν μικροψύχων have felt no common dishonour in being overlooked and insulted.' It is hopelessly flat to suppose that when Jesus spoke about a man causing one 'of these little ones to stumble,' He meant nothing but contempt and dishonour; yet we come upon this view more than once, even in an expositor like Theophylact. Still, the antiquity of an error is no excuse for its survival, and the sharp edge of the sayings of Jesus upon 'stumbling-blocks' is missed to-day by many who have never heard of patristic exegesis.

The central passage is in Lk 17^{1, 2}:

'To his disciples he said: "It is inevitable (ἀνένδεκτον; cf. οὐκ ἐνδέχεται, 13³³) that hindrances (σκάνδαλα) should come, but woe to the man by whom they come; it would be well for him to have a millstone hung round his neck, and be flung into the sea, rather than prove a hindrance to one of these little ones."' The equivalents of both sayings occur in Mt 18^{6, 7}, though in the reverse order: Mark (9⁴²) only records the second saying that a man were better dead than be a pitfall for the faith of others.

Jesus here as elsewhere (Mt 13⁴¹) frankly contemplates the existence of people in His community who may become σκάνδαλα to their fellow-members, i.e. the means of causing their fall. To be a 'hindrance,' in this sense, is to bring about the moral fall of another. We must admit, of course, that it is not the only cause of failure. When cases of backsliding or apostasy occur, they are not always due to the bad influence or un-Christian conduct of another person; Jesus elsewhere allows for inward weakness of mind or will, yielding to the pressure of hardship or circumstances. Men and women do fall away from their faith, but it is not invariably a direct result of what some one else in their society has done or said. In fact, we may

say that Jesus spoke about 'being hindered or tripped up' (σκανδαλίζεσθαι) from two points of view. It was a sin, He taught, to find any hindrance in Himself or in His gospel, to be taken aback and disconcerted by the hardships involved in His service, for example,¹ or by the new departures which He made in religion.² He knew that there was a temptation to be disappointed with what He said and did,³ and that when people saw Him running counter to their prejudices or ignoring some cherished ambition or tradition of their circle, they might be tempted to object, to doubt Him, to cool in their loyalty,⁴ if not to drop out of the ranks of His followers altogether. Paul afterwards spoke of the σκάνδαλον which the cross proved to Jews, but Jesus knew in His own lifetime that He was a σκάνδαλον to some of His contemporaries, owing to the very loyalty of His life to the will of God. It upset some people, among His adherents, to discover that He took a Messianic line so different from what as patriots and pious Jews they expected. In this sense Jesus was a σκάνδαλον to them; He repelled them, and they resented Him; but the fault was theirs not His. On the other hand, He taught that it was a heinous, deadly sin⁵ to prove a σκάνδαλον to others by one's bad conduct. 'Whoever is a hindrance to one of these little ones who believe in me, better for him to have a great millstone hung round his neck, and be sunk in the deep sea. Woe to the world for hindrances! Hindrances have to come (ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἔλθειν τὰ σκάνδαλα), but—woe to the man by whom the hindrance does come!' These are terrible words on what Jesus regarded as the terrible sin of endangering the faith of others, and it is always relevant to analyze what He meant by this particular sin.⁶

¹ So σκανδαλίζονται in Mk 4¹⁷=Mt 13²¹, for which Luke substitutes ἀφίστανται.

² So Mt 11⁶=Lk 7²³, the beatitude: μακάριός ἐστιν ὁς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλοσθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.

³ So Mt 13⁵⁷=Mk 6³ (his fellow-countrymen), Mt 26³¹=Mk 14²⁷ (the disciples), and Mt 15¹² (the Pharisees). Chrysostom points out, from Mt 15¹² and 17²⁷, how Jesus 'taught us when to consider those who are offended' (σκανδαλιζομένων).

⁴ This is the thought of Jn 6⁶¹ (τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει).

⁵ 'Même la mort la plus ignominieuse et la plus cruelle serait préférable au sort éternel qui l'attend après le scandale donné' (Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, ii. pp. 77-78).

⁶ A pointed comment on the subject, from the standpoint of the 'little ones,' is given by Augustine's letter to Felicia (Ep. ccviii).

The context in Mark throws little light on the meaning. Mk 9⁴²⁻⁴⁸ is a paragraph on the danger of σκάνδαλα, both those which arise from human intercourse (v. 42) and those which are due to the passions of one's own nature (vv. 43-48); but the saying on the former does not connect naturally with the preceding sayings and incidents.⁷ The context in Luke may indicate that one of the main features of this sin was the unforgiving spirit in the community, for the saying is at once followed by a demand for mutual forgiveness (Lk 17³⁻⁴). Here again it is what follows that serves to elucidate the meaning. But in Matthew's record the context is more explicit. Jesus has just (17²⁴⁻²⁷) agreed to pay the temple-tax, in order to avoid giving needless offence (ἵνα δὲ μὴ σκανδαλίζωμεν αὐτοῦς). He refuses to leave a wrong impression on the mind of the authorities, or to create a prejudice gratuitously against Himself and His adherents. Then follows the rebuke to the ambitious disciples, leading up to the saying about the danger of outraging and upsetting the faith of weaker disciples. That is, Matthew suggests, by this juxtaposition of sayings on σκάνδαλα, an argument from less to more; if you ought to avoid outraging public opinion, how much more careful should you be to eschew anything that would deflect and injure the religious character of your fellows in the society? Consideration for the interests of the latter is a paramount duty. He then reproduces the Marcan sayings about the members of one's own body⁸ as sources of 'hindrance,' and finally echoes the sayings reproduced in Luke about the duty of brotherly forgiveness, though he does not suggest that the uncharitable, implacable temper was a 'hindrance,' as Luke probably⁹ does.

It is in the light of such references to this sin that we can understand what Jesus had in mind. He was speaking from experience, when He said these heavy words about the people who led or tried to lead others astray. Not long before, He

⁷ The nearest is in v. 37.

⁸ It is possible that Matthew meant members of the community by 'hand' and 'foot' in this connexion (cf. 1 Co 12²⁴⁻²⁵); this would tally with the following paragraph (cf. v. 17). The interpretation goes back to Origen, and is developed by Theophylact and Isho'dad of Merv.

⁹ Cyril of Alexandria (*Comm. on Luke*, tr. from Syriac by R. Payne Smith, vol. ii. p. 533 f.) takes it so. 'And what,' he said, 'are the offences? Mean and annoying actions, I suppose; fits of anger, insults, slanders very frequently.'

had turned sharply on Peter with the rebuke, 'Get behind me, you Satan. You are a hindrance to me' (Mt 16²³). The subtlest temptations may come to us from those who mean well to us, from our very friends who act or speak in all good intention. Peter thought Jesus was throwing His life away, in taking the path that led to suffering and the cross. He thought so, and said so. Jesus was strong enough to brush this hindrance out of His way, but He knew that many weaker disciples would be tempted to yield to the same insidious suggestion. His intense care for them¹ was part and parcel of His teaching on the power and responsibility of influence. 'Let your light shine before men.' 'You are the light of the world.' If you do right, you help others to do right; also, if you do wrong, you drag others down. But He does not imply that this misleading influence is always deliberate. Our personal character and conduct, no doubt, move others either towards or away from God, but Jesus implies that to prove a *σκάνδαλον* to others need not be a conscious attempt to upset their faith. Sometimes (we may probably say much more often) it is involuntary; the man does not realize what are the consequences of his action. None the less, Jesus warns the disciples, a man is responsible for them. He speaks on behalf of the 'little ones,' because it is they who trust instinctively the example and counsels of older Christians, and who are most easily led astray by careless conduct or thoughtless utterances which are taken to sanction a wrong course.² To refuse forgiveness, to suggest by one's example that the demand of discipleship is not so hard as might be supposed, or to teach that confession and hardship may be avoided with impunity—that is, for Jesus, a sin which He visits with the utmost reprobation. We say it is diabolic for any man to corrupt wilfully the innocence of a younger person. Jesus said (cf. Mt 13⁴¹ 16²³) it was diabolic to deflect another's faith, even without any deliberate intention of doing harm; a man were better out of the world altogether than do anything which would lead another Christian to be less loyal to God or to lapse from the faith. Hindrances of this kind are unavoidable, He admitted. Even in a society organized for the highest ends, one

member can interfere with another. Our lives cross one another repeatedly, and no association of men, even for the advancement of the interests of God's kingdom, can exclude the obstacles and pitfalls which arise out of ambition, self-seeking, censoriousness, softness, the natural tendency to shrink from hardness and discipline, undue laxity or undue severity, especially on the part of those who have some authority and influence. We are accustomed to lay grateful stress upon the value which Jesus attached to personal influence as the supreme method of advancing the kingdom of God in this world. But His teaching at this point has a reverse side, and for that we must look to the various groups of sayings about 'hindrances' and 'hindering.' It is a warning to all who teach Christianity,³ a warning not to add or omit, from any motive whatsoever, truths which are vital to the gospel. They will be held responsible for having induced others to take Christ less seriously than He meant. It is also a warning to others, not to convey an erroneous impression of the gospel by their words or actions, when their example or precept may prove the undoing of simpler souls in their own circle.⁴ 'Woe to the world for hindrances!' We have no right to take 'the world' here, with Origen, as the pagan society with which Christians have no connexion. Jesus means the world, 'the very world, which is the world of all of us,' where His followers have to live together, and experience not only the help but the temptations of human intercourse. 'But,' He adds, 'woe to the man by whom the hindrance comes,' that makes another fall away.⁵ It is morally certain that such pitfalls will be met with, in the course of life; yet that does not, in the judgment of Jesus, absolve the individual whose misconduct proves an obstacle to his neighbours. He may bring disaster on them, but he brings a worse disaster on himself.

³ Cf. Ro 16¹⁷. Origen's definition of *σκάνδαλον* (*Cels.* v. 64) is: *ὅπερ εἰώθαμεν λέγειν περὶ τῶν διαστρεφόντων ἀπὸ τῆς ὑγιоῦς διδασκαλίας τοὺς ἀπλουτέρους καὶ εὐεξαπατήτους.*

⁴ Cf. Paul's attitude in Ro 14^{1, 15}, 1 Co 8⁹⁻¹³.

⁵ In Mt 24¹⁰, where Dn 11⁴¹ (*σκανδαλισθήσονται*) is quoted—though there is no allusion to temptation in the O.T. passage—ruin or final apostasy is meant, and this sense is never far from most of the references of Jesus. But the term did not necessarily involve an ir retrievable relapse, as we can see from Paul and Hermas (*Vis.* iv. 1. 3: 'I ask the Lord . . . to grant repentance to his servants' (*τοὺς ἐσκανδαλισμένους*)).

¹ It is reflected in Paul's passionate word of 2 Co 11²⁰ (*τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι*).

² *Σκάνδαλα δὲ νοεὶ τοὺς ἐμποδίζοντας πρὸς τὰ καλὰ* (Theophylact).

Literature.

THE GOLDEN BOUGH.

THE third edition of Sir J. G. Frazer's great work in Magic and Religion called *The Golden Bough* is now complete in twelve volumes. The twelfth volume contains a Bibliography and General Index (Macmillan; 20s. net).

The General Index incorporates the separate indexes to the volume. And it does more. In the later volumes the separate Indexes were much fuller than in the earlier. The author has enlarged the indexes to the earlier volumes, bringing them into line with the rest. It is no longer necessary to search several volumes to find a reference, as we have repeatedly had to do. More than that, it will no longer be our experience to find that the reference is not in the index to *any* of the volumes.

It is such an Index as will give pleasure to consult. Why is the science of indexing still in its infancy? Not one book in a thousand is indexed scientifically, that is, practically. Take an example. Mr. Arnold Toynbee's *Nationality and the War* has an index. This is how Italy is given:

Italy, kingdom of, 100, 102, 243, 245, v., 406, 427, 429, 446, 478, 492, 506.
Italy, Union of (Risorgimento), 8-9, 98, 100, 103, 108, 173-4, 211-2, 249, 287.

That is not an extreme example, by any means. The distinction between 'Italy, kingdom of' and 'Italy, Union of' is an advance on the ordinary index. But suppose that we have read this book and remember that somewhere in it the statement is made that the lack of harmony between Greece and Albania is due to Italy. If we turn to Albania in the Index we are faced with fourteen references to pages; if to Greece we are confronted with sixteen. We try Italy at last and resolve to turn to page after page until we find it. That is the unscientific index. This is how Italy is done in Sir J. G. Frazer's General Index:

Italy, change in the flora of, i. 8; 'Sawing the Old Woman' at Mid-Lent in, iv. 240 *sq.*; seven-legged effigies of Lent in, iv. 244 *sq.*; swinging as a festal rite in modern, iv. 283, 284; hot springs in, v. 213;

divination at Mid-summer in, v. 254; 'killing the Hare' at harvest in, vii. 280; cure of warts in, ix. 48; birth-trees in, xi. 165; mistletoe in, xi. 316, 317.

Italy, ancient, spinning on highroads forbidden to women in, i. 113, viii. 119 *n.*⁵; forests of, ii. 8; tree-worship in, ii. 10; sacred groves in, ii. 122; oaks sacred to Jupiter in, ii. 361; vintage inaugurated by priests in, viii. 133; colleges of the Salii in, ix. 232; the Ambarvalia in, ix. 359.

Sir J. G. Frazer has prepared the General Index himself. The Bibliography has been prepared by the Press Reader. He has gathered all the references in literature in the footnotes into an alphabetical order and the thing is done. And yet, to our thinking, the Bibliography will be of even greater value than the Index.

WESLEY'S JOURNAL.

The sixth volume has been issued of *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.*, as edited by Mr. Nehemiah Curnock and others (Kelly). The illustrations and notes are as satisfactory as before, leaving nothing undone or requiring improvement, so far as can at present be perceived. And it is not at all likely that future editors will find much to reward the most diligent research, so thorough has been the labour of love which the editor and his assistants have accomplished. There is little doubt that for many a day, if not for all the days, this will be the standard edition. The Notes are written with a distinct sense of style—a good thing for them, else had they suffered severely by comparison with the text. There are four special Notes, one of which, as example for all, we shall quote:

'The American War, even before the outbreak of hostilities, was the background of the present sections of Wesley's Journal. Both in England and New England politicians were beating ploughshares into swords. The Church, too feeble or too deeply compromised to interpose, gazed with unseeing eyes on the moral problems involved. Meanwhile, two men of providence wrestled with the situation. John Wesley saved England;

Francis Asbury, in the same sense and by exactly similar means, saved America. Asbury, in labours, suffering, spiritual force, intensity and persistency of purpose, and absolute selflessness, rivalled, if he did not outrival, Wesley. Through mother, master, and early friends; through the evangelical clergy heard in the old parish church of West Bromwich and Methodist preachers heard in the great hollow near Wednesbury, he became a faithful replica of Wesley. His novitiate began under Alexander Mather. His school of athletic fitness for a prodigious physical task was his Methodist master's forge. His theological college was his mother's class-meeting, in which also he learned and practised the mystery of extempore prayer and exposition. His brotherly oversight of his master's son taught him the true pastor's art, and won for him a life-long friendship. Another companion of early youth, Richard Whatcoat, saintly and faithful, became coadjutor-bishop of his old age.

'In four English appointments (1766 to 1770) Asbury learned the "Methodist plan"—itinerancy, early morning, lay, and field preaching, society meetings, Quarterly Meeting finance, Conference rule and discipline—the value of time, method, health, books, music, and the incessant breaking of new ground. Inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost, he attended the Bristol Conference of 1771, and was accepted as a volunteer. His circuit was America. He went saturated with Wesley's thoughts, resolutely set on carrying out the "Methodist plan." Within a fortnight after his arrival in New York he was facing colleagues who urged him to settle in the occupied cities. But he had heard the call of the wilderness and of the Lord of the wilderness. "Calm and dauntless, he declared himself fixed to the Methodist plan." For nearly fifty years he was the outrider of an ever-growing army of apostolic men who knew neither self nor fear, who conquered a continent and covered it with a network of circuits and conferences.'

LUTHER.

Has any man ever in all the history of the world had to pass through such a fire of criticism as Luther? In his lifetime it was as hot as most men have had to meet. But it has lasted, and to-day there is as much ferocity in it as ever. Some amazing books have been published, making

charges which had to be repudiated at once by all decent not to say scientific historians. But to see how keen the fire is still one has only to turn to the fourth volume of Professor Hartmann Grisar's *Luther* (Kegan Paul; 12s. net). Grisar, as we have said already more than once, is a painstaking scholar and writes with a desire to be fair and accurate. Yet even he cannot avoid a complete misrepresentation of Luther's mind and conduct in the chapter which he sensationally calls 'Luther and Lying.'

One of the subdivisions of the chapter is entitled 'The New Theology of Lying.' In that subdivision Professor Grisar finds 'Luther's disregard for the laws of truth' in 'the theory he set up of the permissibility of lies.' This 'theory,' he says, was due to his studies in the Old Testament. 'It seems to him that in certain Old Testament instances of such lies those who employed them were not to blame. Abraham's lie in denying that Sarah was his wife, the lie of the Egyptian midwives about the Jewish children, Michal's lie told to save David, appear to Luther justifiable, useful, and wholesome. On Oct. 2, 1524, in his Sermons on Exodus, as it would seem for the first time, he defended his new theory. Lies were only real lies "when told for the purpose of injuring our neighbour"; but, "if I tell a lie, not in order to injure anyone but for his profit and advantage and in order to promote his best interests, this is a lie of service"; such was the lie told by the Egyptian midwives and by Abraham; such lies fall "under the grace of Heaven, *i.e.* came under the forgiveness of sins"; such falsehoods "are not really lies."

Now it is wonderful to find a member of the Society of Jesus denouncing the theory that in certain cases the end justifies the means, but so it is. The blunder, for it is a blunder on the part of Professor Grisar and no malicious intention, is due to forgetfulness of the difference between Luther's day and ours. To the followers of Luther lying is an abominable thing. To Luther it was abominable also; but he could not see, as we do, that the Old Testament is a history of progress in morality, and it was easier for him, owing to his Catholic environment, to 'explain the lies' of Abraham or of Sarah.

It is thirty years since Mr. George Lorimer gave to the world the result of his research among the

records of St. Cuthbert's Church in Edinburgh. The book has long been out of print. Now therefore a new book has been written and published, which incorporates the old. In thirty years Mr. Lorimer has made many discoveries, and the new book is a handsome quarto. It is published by Messrs. Blackwood under the title of *The Early Days of St. Cuthbert's Church, Edinburgh* (7s. 6d. net).

Perhaps the most interesting, certainly the most amazing, part of the book is the chapter entitled 'Discipline.' Mr. Lorimer sets down things which he himself wonders at, and thanks God that he lives in a better time. For we have made this discovery—and it is a very great and blessed one—that punishment and public shame harden the heart and lead to greater evil, and do not bring true repentance or amendment of life. How is it, with our Saviour's 'Neither do I condemn thee' so conspicuously in our sight, how is it that it has taken us so long to learn that?

Students of the Petrine literature must not miss *Studies in the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, by E. Iliff Robson, B.D. (Cambridge University Press; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Robson has read all the literature to date and the Epistle itself. He concludes thus: (1) there are four passages of a Petrine character, a Preaching (1⁵⁻¹¹), a Gospel (1¹⁶⁻¹⁸), a Prophecy (1²⁰⁻²¹⁹), and an Apocalypse (3⁸⁻¹³); (2) these four passages are fitted together (as cement fits and fixes the stones in a porch) by an editor, who prefixes, quite honestly, a formal salutation in the name of Peter; introduces the subject of Prophecy with a skilful sentence looking both backward and forward; and closes it with a natural, if not very literary, comment. After giving his reasons for preferring Apostolic citations to his own efforts (iii. 1, 2), he quotes a passage certainly not his own, for the opening words are from the 'Prophetic Word,' also cited by Clement of Rome. At the conclusion of this passage, he writes an Epilogue which most skilfully sums up all that has gone before: 'Be zealous in virtuous living; do not be led astray on the subject of the Parousia, but grow in grace and knowledge.'

The literature of Missions is at last coming to be recognized as part of the literature of the world. The missionary has discovered that it is not enough to be earnest; he must also be interesting.

A great advance in the direction of popular appeal is made by a volume on *The Vital Forces of Christianity and Islam* (Humphrey Milford; 3s. 6d. net). It contains six studies by six separate authors—(1) 'Vital Elements in Islam,' by the Rev. W. H. T. Gairdner, Cairo; (2) 'Specific Points in Islam with which Moslems are dissatisfied,' by the Rev. W. A. Shedd, D.D., Urumia; (3) 'Elements in the Christian Gospel and Christian Life which appeal to Moslems,' by Pastor Gottfried Simon, Sumatra; (4) 'Elements in the Christian Gospel and Christian Life which awaken Opposition and create Difficulty among Moslems,' by Professor Stewart Crawford, Beirut; (5) 'Points of Contact between Christianity and Islam,' by Professor Sirāju'd Din, Lahore; and (6) 'Light shed on the Vital Elements of Christianity and on the New Testament by contact with Islam,' by Canon Godfrey Dale, Zanzibar. An introduction is contributed by Dr. S. M. Zwemer, and a closing Essay by Professor D. B. Macdonald.

To their long list of large and marvellously cheap books Messrs. Jack have added *A Guide to the English Language* (5s. net). It is a very thick quarto, double column, and is divided into four parts. The first part treats of Composition, the second of Vocabulary, the third of Style, and the fourth of many minor matters. The work is all original, every chapter having its own author; and Mr. H. C. O'Neill being the editor is guarantee for the accuracy of the whole work. It is not merely for authors that the book has been prepared; the letter-writer will find it useful. And those who rarely write even a letter may also consult it profitably, for it will enable them to speak more correctly than they do. No doubt teachers will discover its worth for their work. But they must not rejoice over the discovery, for it is able to make the teacher a superfluity.

The life of Jacob offers excellent material for a popular study of psychology, and the Rev. Henry Howard is the very man to make a good use of it. In ten chapters he exhibits Jacob passing from place to place and from state to state, the state not being without influence on the place any more than the place on the state, till we see him at last in the court of the Pharaoh, with his polite but penetrating record, 'Few and evil have been the days of the years of my life.' But he was a Prince with

God who made that humble confession. And so the title of the book is *A Prince in the Making* (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net).

The Apocalypse of St. John is issued in 'The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures' (Longmans; 1s. net). The Introduction is up to date and useful. The notes are, as before, reduced to the barest necessity. The text is in fine large type. It is a real pleasure to know that Roman Catholics will be encouraged so happily to read the Bible for themselves.

The Rev. Paul B. Bull, M.A., Priest of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield, has written a book on *The Sacramental Principle* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). By the Sacramental Principle he means the truth 'that spirit expresses itself in matter, and that the material universe is a burning bush, aflame with the will and purpose of God.' The universe may be explained in three ways. One way is that there is nothing in it but matter. All is material fact and force. This is materialistic monism. Another way is that there is nothing but mind or spirit. All is due to our thinking. This is spiritualistic monism. Mr. Bull believes that both methods of explaining the universe are wrong. The right way is to accept both matter and spirit as realities and believe that matter is always being moulded by spirit. This is the Sacramental Principle.

Now in Mr. Bull's experience the Sacramental Principle is best seen in the Holy Communion. And it is to commend to Puritans and Protestants generally this view of the eucharist that the book is written. It is Mr. Bull's 'apologia pro vita sua,' his answer to the question why he is a Priest of the Community of the Resurrection.

A series of Good Friday addresses on *The Cross and Passion* delivered by the Rev. George Hodges, Dean of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, Mass., has been published by Messrs. Macmillan (4s. 6d. net). The addresses are on the Seven Words. It is a strange providence that has made these seven sentences the subject of so much exposition. The same things are said over and over again. But the Words are not exhausted. And there comes an expositor now and then—like Bishop Bernard last month or Dean Hodges this month—who looks at them for himself and inter-

prets them afresh out of his own understanding and experience.

Dean Hodges has also written a volume on *The Episcopal Church, its Faith and Order* (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net). It handles ten topics in ten chapters. Each topic and each chapter is complete by itself, and no desire seems to have been felt to connect it with its neighbours. The topics are: The Bible, the Prayer Book, Baptism, Confirmation, Renunciation, Obedience, the Creed, the Church, Prayer, the Holy Communion. The writing is pleasantly simple and clear. It is a book of instruction for young people, to whom its freedom from the rigidity of system will be half its recommendation.

The Rev. Cyril Hepher went out to New Zealand 'to preach a Mission' at Havelock, which is a small town in the North Island. The Vicar of Havelock, by name Alan Gardiner, found a few Quakers in his parish and offered them his vestry as a meeting-house. He even joined them, he and his family. And others followed the example. When Mr. Hepher arrived, the meetings had been held for some time in the church. It was with misgiving that he, a High Churchman, joined in the silent prayer which was the form of worship. But the blessing he received proved the wisdom of the movement. And now he has written the whole story and advocated earnestly the use of silent prayer in worship, publishing it all in a book called *The Fellowship of Silence* (Macmillan).

Mr. Hepher has not written the whole book himself. There is a chapter in it by the late Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, and there are two chapters by his daughter, Miss L. V. Hodgkin. These are the Quaker chapters. There are chapters also by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, and the Rev. J. C. Fitzgerald. And from first to last the object is to encourage the Church to make silent prayer a part of her worship and to enjoy the fellowship that it gives. So it is a book with a purpose; but it is as delightful to read as if it were a work of art pure and simple.

Henry Osborn Taylor, Litt.D., sees men everywhere in search of salvation. But what is salvation? It is freedom of the spirit. It is deliverance from the bondage of corruption. It is entrance into the glorious liberty of the sons of

God. It is fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.

The greater the personality the more earnest the search. Dr. Osborn Taylor begins with the Chaldeans and Egyptians, passes to China, thence to India and to Persia, and reaches the land of Israel. He keeps to the chronological, not the geographical order. So after the Prophets of Israel come the Poets and the Philosophers of Greece, whence, through certain Intermediaries, he brings us to Jesus. From Jesus he carries us to Paul and to Augustine, and bids us look into the future. The title of the last chapter is 'The Arrows are beyond thee.'

We said that *Deliverance*—that is the title of the book (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net)—is communion with the Father through the Son. We see that when we come to Jesus. Dr. Taylor does not say that the Chaldeans or any other of the ancient nations found deliverance consciously, as did the Hebrew prophets, in a coming Messiah. But when we see that to him Jesus is no less than the Son of God, we understand that he finds the words, 'No one cometh unto the Father but by me,' applicable to all men, and the true source of their salvation. For, as John says, He was always coming into the world, though the world as a whole knew Him not.

It is a valuable book, and it is written by one whose appreciation of the English language is revealed in the trouble he takes with it.

Mr. Yone Noguchi, who wrote a little book on *The Spirit of Japanese Poetry* for Mr. Murray's 'Wisdom of the East' series, has now written for the same series a similar book on *The Spirit of Japanese Art* (2s. net). It is not Japan that is a wonder to the West, it is every single Japanese man. Mr. Noguchi knows the art of his native land as well as its literature, and he can write in English with the grammatical accuracy and idiomatic supremacy of a born Briton.

The Rev. R. L. Bellamy, B.D., LL.D., Rector of Kirkby Overblow, has published six Lenten addresses on the government of the tongue. *The Unruly Member* is the title (Nisbet; 1s. 6d. net). The topics are Truthfulness, Slander, Candour, Hastiness, Profanity, Silence. Dr. Bellamy is as alive to the sins of the tongue as was the Lord's brother. Especially is he alive to the sin of pro-

fanity. Referring to the reverence felt by Jews for the sacred Name, he says: 'A good Jew will always try to avoid treading upon a scrap of paper, for fear that that Name might be written on it. Another curious evidence of this reverence is to be found in the Jews' system of numerals. They employ the letters of their alphabet for this purpose, as, roughly speaking, we might consider A to equal 1, B to equal 2, and so on. But when they come to the number 15, instead of combining the letters which stand for 10 and 5, they depart from the ordinary rule and use those which stand for 9 and 6 (טו). And the sole reason for this is because the two letters which stand for 10 and 5 (יה) are the same two with which the sacred Name "Jehovah" (יהוה) begins.'

With all its practical purpose *Factors in Conduct*, by Dr. Thiselton Mark (Unwin; 3s. 6d. net), is a contribution to theoretical ethics of very great value. Still, it is practice and not theory that Dr. Mark is concerned with. His objective is conduct not conversation. It is conversation in the old sense of that word, the whole attitude and action of the daily life. It is the Apostle's 'Let your conversation be such as becometh the Gospel of Christ.'

First of all he sets us in our right relation to the Universe. Next he discusses the connexion between Conduct and Morality. Then he shows that Morality is such Conduct as tends to Harmony between the Self and Reality. Finally he explains the influence that Conduct and Personality have on one another. Get young men and women to read this excellent and exhilarating book before the evil days come.

Religion and Moral Civilisation is the title of the Prolegomena to an Historical Enquiry into the Influence of Religion upon Moral Civilisation (Watts; 2s. 6d. net). The author, Mr. Frank Hill Perrycoste, B.Sc., says: 'The object of this Essay is to enquire into the actual historical influence of religion upon morality, not from the standpoint of one who eagerly seizes upon all evidence unfavourable to a hostile system and suppresses or mis-states all such facts as make in favour of that system, but from the standpoint of an opponent of religion, certainly, and one who has gradually learnt to consider that, on the whole and in net result, religion has been a curse to mankind

—yet an honest and candid opponent, who intends to cite every available piece of evidence, whether favourable or adverse to religion, that he has been able to collect from the materials which he has studied.'

He is anxious to be considered fair while 'frankly announcing his anti-religious convictions.' But it is amusing to find him confessing that he has 'split a record or a quotation into two or more parts, and assigned these to different and perhaps widely separated chapters.' 'If by chance,' he then says, 'any reader, turning up a

reference, should find that something derogatory is quoted but some qualifying praise omitted, he may rest quite assured that, were the complete work before him, he would find the balance of praise duly credited to the proper account in the appropriate chapter.' Now the complete work is not likely to be 'before' the reader for some time. It is to consist of forty-eight chapters, of which the present volume contains only four chapters, and other four have been published previously.

What is the object? It is to prove that the best education is a purely secular one.

The Beatitudes.

BY PROFESSOR ROBERT MACKINTOSH, M.A., D.D., LANCASHIRE COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

WE have had handed down to us, in two different forms, a group of sayings spoken by Jesus at the outset—both traditions agree in this—of His greatest connected discourse regarding the Kingdom of God. The sayings may number seven, or eight, or nine. According to the version in Matthew, there are nine apparently—all of them beatitudes. According to the version in Luke, there are four beatitudes flanked by four woes or curses. On the whole, with reservations to be noted below, one concludes that Matthew's report is much the more credible. Our brief investigation takes no account of the problems of higher criticism, but its results may easily be harmonized with the usually accepted solutions of the Synoptic problem. So far as we are concerned, it is equally thinkable that Luke modified the tradition, or that it came into his hands already recast.

Let us begin with the common nucleus of four beatitudes. In calling it a nucleus, one does not mean to affirm that the nucleus was ever separately published. To the present writer, that seems in a high degree improbable. It may have been a nucleus in the mind of Jesus, round which other kindred material gathered. But it will be safest to understand 'nucleus' as merely a piece of classification or generalization. We shall employ the term, as lawyers say, 'without prejudice.'

(a) The nucleus does, however, reveal a common character, as contrasted even with Matthew's remaining beatitudes. The four sayings which are

jointly attested might be termed the 'paradoxes' of the Kingdom of God. To be poor, to be sad, to be hungry—*i.e.* full of longings—to be persecuted, is to be *happy*. Of course each paradox is fully half resolved by the time Jesus has completed the sentence in which He formulates it; He is no epigrammatist, talking for effect. But it was His manner, to startle His audience into thinking. He catches their ears at the outset with one, two, three sayings which begin as a challenge to the stolid common sense of worldly minds.

(b) It follows that Matthew's expansions are more likely to be interpretative glosses than a literal historical report of what Jesus said. The position is not quite clear; one might quote O.T. parallels, like Is 57¹⁵ or 66², which include as much interpretative matter as we find in Matthew's version of the Beatitudes. Yet one judges it likelier upon the whole that Jesus did not Himself blunt the startling quality of His opening half sentences. On the other hand, Matthew (backed as we have noted by the O.T.) seems altogether right *ad sensum*. The 'poverty' which Jesus—or which the O.T.—commends is not mere impecuniosity. Since wealth is a temptation and virtuous industry a safeguard, the word 'poor'—and kindred terms—had come in the later days of the O.T. to connote godliness.

(c) There is a direct O.T. origin for the second beatitude; it comes—almost *verbatim*, after the Greek Bible—from Is 61². When we compare

Luke's synagogue sermon at Nazareth, we see how closely the two Gospels—our first and our third—agree in the keynote which they sound at the outset of their record of Jesus' teaching. Matthew as well as Luke makes Christ begin with 'glad tidings to the poor,' and with a promise of consolation to the mourners. For the promise to the hungry, we should rather compare Ps 107^{5, 9}. The promise to the persecuted does not admit of O.T. parallels. Partly, and obviously, the hope of 'reward in heaven' was too late in its origin to create within ancient Israel any Christian tone of triumphant joy. But, more deeply too, the whole 'worship of sorrow'—if one may borrow a striking though not altogether accurate phrase—is Christ's creation. His people are happy not merely in spite of, but because of their sufferings and persecutions. Let us just note that the blessing pronounced upon the mourner remains unglossed. If any gloss were introduced, we should have to explain the sorrowfulness which Christ praises as sorrow for sin—the pangs of a conscience-stricken mind. Some of the O.T. verses already referred to might support that interpretation. Yet on the whole we may be glad that not these verses but rather the pattern of Is 61² has prevailed, and that other sadnesses besides the sacred sorrow of penitence are included in the welcome uttered by Jesus.

(d) The nucleus as we find it in Luke has no softening explanations. Everything is clear-cut and sharply defined. Hence some not unnaturally hold that the Lucan tradition of the sayings is the more original, Wendt, *e.g.*, recognizing in it Jesus' desire to speak 'with the greatest emphasis and brevity.' Not because that is an unfair report of Jesus' manner, but because of peculiarities in the present passage yet to be noted, one is strongly disinclined to think that the social-revolutionary version gives us the real or even the literal teaching of the Master. Yet the social-revolutionary reading of Christ's words is attested not merely in the Third Gospel, but in the Epistle of James. And, absurd as is the view that primitive Christianity was a proletarian striving—who can say how much of this element may have co-operated with higher influences? Nay, who can show—or could wish to show—that these enthusiastic or even wild hopes had not their part to play in the redemption of the world?

(e) A question of no great importance still remains. Is 'Matthew' right, who puts the sayings

in the third person, or Luke, who transfers them to the second? Matthew, I believe. If I may trust my sense of Greek idiom—but this I do not do unreservedly—the Greek lends itself better to Matthew's formulation; the difference being of course confined to a single Greek word in each verse—'yours,' 'theirs.' True, of course, that Matthew's closing saying itself gives us 'Blessed are *ye*.' But this argument is double-edged. The closing saying in Matthew is no longer than any of the others; where it stands as number 4 in Luke, it again appears of unusual length—quite out of proportion even to the length of the fourth Woe, which Luke balances over against it! A saying of exceptional type, more fitted to stand at the end than in the middle—surely it is the first gospel, not the third, which must be followed here! And so we may accept the first Gospel's 'Blessed are *they*'—if it were of importance; it hardly is.¹

II.

What shall we say regarding Luke's enlargement of the nucleus by adding four corresponding Woes, or Curses?

The Pentateuch tells of a hilltop scene, in which blessings (on obedience) were to be spoken from one mountain, and curses (upon disobedience) from another. The text has reached us in curious confusion. In that passage, at any rate, blessings have disappeared, and curses alone remain—a state of matters which a Christian may well be disposed to think characteristic of the economy of law. Shall we not call it equally characteristic if the N.T. shows a converse change? If here it is the curses that disappear—if blessings alone are spoken by Christ on His hilltop? But let us look at the evidence. We have already confessed that Jesus *might* have intensified His emphasis by antithetic enlargements. No human speaker was ever so unguarded as this Master of ours. One might almost say, He had rather be misapprehended than that the truth He spoke should be wholly neglected. He is our great example—but, before we ourselves strive to copy Him in detail, let us be sure we are equal in

¹ Supplementary evidence against Luke's record might be added from the next words he subjoins, 'I say unto you *that hear*.' If these are not an echo from omitted parts of the discourse: 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you'; they are an awkward return from the rhetorical apostrophe of the absent 'rich' to the actual surroundings of the Speaker.

some sense to His methods. It is useless for weaklings to seek to bend Ulysses' bow.

The evidence will be found particularly in the 'reasons annexed' to each blessing or to its corresponding curse—they hang very closely together. The mourners are happy—for they are to laugh; those that laugh are unhappy—for they are to mourn and weep. The hungry are to be full—and the full are to be hungry. Is this an intenser emphasis upon spiritual truth? Or is it—more likely—a degraded version of Jesus' words?¹ The world is well aware that 'he laughs best who laughs last.' We hardly need Holy Writ to confirm us in that persuasion; nor should we expect the school of Christ to find in *that* circumstance the distinctive superiority of godliness over sin. The first blessing of all stands in Luke as good as unchanged. There is something to be learned, however, from the first Woe. The rich 'have *received* their *consolation*.' One word—'have *received*' appears to be an interesting echo of Mt 6^{2. 5. 16}; the other—'consolation'—recalls Is 61², Mt 5⁴. But is it not misplaced in Luke? The *promise* of consolation is appropriate to those who are now mournful; the *taunt* of 'consolation already' is cruel mockery if addressed to those who have fallen victims to 'the deceitfulness of riches.' Surely the mocker is Luke, or an Ebionite source of Luke's, rather than Jesus Christ. The *last* 'woe' is exceedingly interesting and felicitous, yet not beyond the power of pious Christians who had begun an antithetic amplification of the Beatitudes and knew the O.T. well.

Accordingly, while it is not unthinkable that Jesus should have spoken as Lucan tradition alleges, and while the meaning is much the same on either tradition, the strong probability seems to be that the Woes are unoriginal—an idea borrowed from the denunciations of Mt 23, Lk 11.

III.

Lastly, we have to consider Matthew's additional beatitudes, and their possible O.T. origin.

The blessing on the *meek* seems to be unoriginal in this context. It is a mere literal repetition of Ps 37¹¹—unimproved. It stands between the

second and the third of the Paradoxes, interrupting them. It really covers the same ground as the first beatitude. 'Poor' and 'meek' are absolute synonyms. They are merely rival renderings of a single O.T. word. Finally, Jesus has risen above promising inheritance in the 'land.' The Kingdom He pledges is incorruptible and unfading. It is an altogether 'better hope.'

The blessing on the *merciful* is almost equally literal in its dependence on Ps 18²⁵. Almost, but not quite; it exhibits at least something of that characteristic heightening which we generally find when Jesus borrows O.T. sayings. And the thought, we know, was characteristic of our Lord; compare, e.g., Matthew's sequel to the Lord's Prayer (Mt 6^{14. 15}).

The blessing on the *pure* may be described as a marked heightening, as well as reiteration of Ps 24⁴. What is the requirement for admission to the presence of the King of kings? A pure heart! Such a one shall *see God*.

The blessing on the *peacemakers* seems to be absolutely original. The word appears to have no O.T. parallel; the only N.T. parallel² seems to be the verse in Col. which speaks of God's making peace by the blood of Christ's cross. The *promise* in this case comes out of the very heart of Jesus. It meets us again when He speaks in the same chapter to those who love their enemies.

We may infer then, with high probability, that Jesus spoke three paradoxes—blessings on the poor, the sad, the longing; followed them up by three positive moral requirements—pronouncing blessings on the merciful, the pure, the peacemakers; clinched all six in a seventh saying, half paradox, half requirement—'Blessed are the *persecuted* who suffer for *righteousness*' sake.' He can give these no higher promise than He gave to the poor! Those who are heirs to God's Kingdom inherit all things. But—as many an expositor has noted—those persecuted for righteousness' sake have been tested and have stood firm. And so the chain returns upon itself. The first saying and the seventh are linked in one. Lastly, Jesus restates His concluding beatitude with direct reference to His own disciples: 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you.'

Christ's words then pronounce a blessing first on human need, next on humble human goodness.

² Apart from the echo, Ja 3¹⁸.

¹ There is something closely analogous in Lk 17; but one recalls Sharman's judgment, that the greater part of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus may be Judaism untouched by the Christian spirit.

While the Lucan tradition concentrated on the paradoxical praise of need, we may feel tolerably confident that Jesus' blessings included alike those who needed help and those who were fitted to help others. This supreme Son of God knew no painful friction between religion and morality, between faith and 'works.' Yet no one can suppose that Christ leaves the smallest loophole to self-righteousness! The goodness He praises is that which

needs mercy from God and accepts mercy as a supreme boon.

We may also infer from these sayings what is, in Jesus' mind, the central spiritual significance of the Kingdom of God. Comfort—satisfaction—Divine mercy—the unclouded sight of God—to be the true child of such a Father. Blessed, indeed, are they whom the King thus welcomes into God's Kingdom!

Recent Foreign Theology.

Know Thyself.¹

STUDENTS of philosophy, who are unable to read Italian, can now read in their mother tongue some of the works of contemporary Italian thinkers, and can form some estimate of the philosophic activity of Italy. Some of the works of Croce have already been translated, one of the works of Alliotta we noticed lately, and now the work of Varisco has been made accessible to the English reader in the volume before us. The translation of Varisco's *Great Problems* has already been published in the 'Library of Philosophy.' In the same library has also been published Professor Villa's *Contemporary Psychology*. We mention these works in order that the reader may be aware of the philosophical activity of Italy, and of the place she is taking in the great endeavour to understand ourselves and the world in which we live. We have mentioned only a few of the contributions of Italy to contemporary thought which have been rendered into English; but these are only a part of her work, and represent writers whose eminence is great enough to have transcended the Alps. Students of philosophy ought to keep their eye on Italy. Croce, Alliotta, and Varisco have not the same point of view. Nay, they have criticized the works of each other. But the notable thing about them all is that they take up the universal tradition, and labour at the problems

of philosophy as these are determined, not by the tradition of any one country, but by the interaction of all the countries that have striven with the great questions of philosophy in all the ages of the past. In the works of these writers we have mentioned, reference is constantly made to authors who have written in English, in French, in German, and even in Russian. That is one of the notable things in contemporary Italian philosophy. It grasps the problem as it has been set to former ages, and to other nations than the Italian.

Professor Varisco deals in this volume with what may be called the fundamental problem of philosophy, and deals with it in a most suggestive way. The reader must, however, bring patience and interest to the study of the volume. There are many things in the argument which give him pause, for the connexion or the inference is not at once apparent. This arises partly from the character of the argument, and partly from the style. While the translation is on due scrutiny intelligible, it is not always couched in the forms which an Englishman is wont to use. The style adds a little to the difficulty of mastering the author's argument. Yet with diligence the book can be understood.

We think that we must begin with a characteristic quotation, which illustrates the style and also the method of reasoning of the author. It is from the introduction, and the paragraph is called 'Consciousness and Subconsciousness.' It is as follows: 'No doubt, to admit this conclusion, indeed to understand it, we must admit that the constitutive consciousness is not equally clear in every subject: over and above the clear or actual consciousness, there is another, and much larger,

¹ 'Library of Philosophy,' edited by J. H. Muirhead, LL.D. *Know Thyself*, by Bernardino Varisco, Professor of Theoretic Philosophy in the University of Rome. Translated by Guglielmo Salvadori, Ph.D., Lecturer in Moral Philosophy in the University of Rome. London: George Allen & Unwin Limited. 10s. 6d. net.

sphere of subconsciousness. And that such a subconsciousness exists, is an undeniable implication of consciousness. I remember: that, which I now remember, would not be that element of my consciousness which in fact it is, if it had not been already an element of my subconsciousness. Our being clearly conscious is in every case the result of a process which implies subconscious elements, and partly takes place in subconsciousness. Moreover, subconsciousness is not a *Deus ex machina* introduced with the object of eliminating difficulties: this would be an elusive contrivance. Consciousness is nothing but subconsciousness organised.' It will be well, however, to state the course of the author's exposition and argument. Almost the whole argument is given in broad outline in the introduction, the doctrine of the phenomenal universe forms the opening paragraph. Then follow sections dealing with reality and cognition—the Subject, Existence of other Subjects, Existence of External Bodies, Mutual Interference of Subjects, Consciousness and Subconsciousness, Unity and Multiplicity, Distinction between Existence and Knowledge, and Distinction between Truth and Error. It will be well that the reader should linger over the introduction, and ponder it somewhat deeply. He will find difficulties in fully understanding the meaning, but he will at least see that there is a meaning. He will need some agility in taking the leaps needed to keep up with the author. At all events he ought to look at the theses in the introduction as statements to be made good in the body of the work. They are problems to be solved, but it will be well to see what the problems are.

Then in the work itself, the chapters are the Subject, First Principle, the Subject, Reality, Fact, and Cognition, Thought, Unity and Multiplicity, and the Absolute. There are appendices, one on Experience, Religion, Philosophy; a second on Human Knowledge; and a third replies to criticisms of his former work on Great Problems.

It is not possible to set forth in detail the long and intricate argument of the author, though it deserves the closest attention in every step of it. But some conception of the gist of it may be given. Beginning with a brief statement of what he calls objective cognition, he immediately shows that objective cognition, valuable though it is, is not exhaustive. It is abstract, and therefore unequal to the description of the fulness of life or

of experience. There remains the whole question of the reference to a subject of knowledge. 'The process of knowing, that is to say an activity which manifests itself in a great number of acts of cognition; that is to say the totality of objective cognitions which result from these acts: the subject, that is to say the centre of irradiation, without which the acts would not be manifestations of one and the same activity: the object, that is to say what in each case opposes itself to the subject as knowing: experience, that is to say the totality of facts which form the matter of the single cognitions,—are elements of one unity, elements which we must distinguish, but not hypostatise' (p. 6). These then are elements in one unity, any one of them taken by itself is an abstraction. The real is the unity of them all. What then is this unity? It is the unity of the subject, which is the centre of its own universe, and each of the elements mentioned above is an element of the subject. But a further inquiry has to be undertaken. What is the subject? The answer is not simple or obvious. 'I only exist in relation to the whole, and the whole exists only in relation to me' (p. 35). Such, in brief, is the conclusion reached by the author at the conclusion of the section called The First Principle. It is a conclusion sufficiently impressive, and the steps of the argument by which the author seeks to establish it deserve attention. Some of these steps are valid, some of them are not so cogent. He postulates a subjective unity to start with, but the postulated unity is not the consciousness of self, but the unity which develops through activity and organization towards explicit self-consciousness. 'The development of self-consciousness necessarily presupposes a primitive unity of consciousness,—a unity which exists in so far as it is not alien, but present to itself, or, in other words, in so far as it is, in an embryonic form, self-conscious.' In this regard the author occasionally indulges in what may be called the natural history of the individual. He describes in quite felicitous terms the evolution of the chicken from the egg, and happily describes the evolution of the primitive unity of consciousness into self-consciousness. It is quite interesting, but it is attended with difficulties. One of these is that the natural history implies that the subject has a beginning and a history; on the other hand the subject is eternal, is the subject of all experience, and as necessary to the whole as

the whole is to it. The author is well aware of the difficulty and seeks to face it, without success. Another difficulty is the relation of the conscious to the subconscious. We are told by the author that 'Consciousness is nothing but subconsciousness organised.' Apparently the original and directive unity is subconsciousness, by it the work is done, and to it the organized consciousness is wholly indebted. The author is aware of the risk involved in the argument. For he warns us that, 'Subconsciousness is not a *Deus ex machina* introduced with the object of eliminating difficulties: that would be an illusive contrivance.' But this is precisely what occurs in many parts of the author's argument. On the whole the larger rôle is played by the subconscious. Nor is it ever shown what benefit arises out of consciousness when it has appeared on the scene. Nor is the reference to memory convincing. For when we strive to recollect any name, and search for it in the domain of the subconscious, the essence of the matter is that when we recognize what we have searched for, we recognize it as something which has been in consciousness before. The subconscious is a warehouse in which is stored what has been already in consciousness.

In the chapter on the Subject the author seeks to show how the primitive unity is developed until it becomes the subject properly so called. Even when we hesitate to follow the author in all his deductions, yet the endeavour to do so is always stimulating and instructive. Quite clear and cogent is the distinction between the relation subject-object, and between (say) Peter and Paul. 'That a developed subject is a constituent of another developed subject is evidently not true. The two consciousnesses are distinct, are two, not as constitutive parts of one and the same consciousness, but as consciousnesses. Therefore, the same reasons, for which the duality subject-object must be resolved into a primitive unity, require that the duality Peter-Paul should be recognised as primitive' (p. 48). Relations between Subjects is the next theme, and it is one to be closely studied. While one consciousness cannot be a part of another, yet the subjects form a system essential to each. It is a system of many centres, each of which is a centre of its own world, yet all of them are bound together into one system. 'One single unity, in course of development, accounts fully for the duality subject-object,

since the consciousness of that duality is still one consciousness. But it does not account for the duality Peter-Paul, for though Peter and Paul are inseparable it remains true that Peter's consciousness is different from that of Paul. Peter and Paul may see the same things, but the seeing of Peter is not the seeing of Paul. They both think according to the same laws: but the thinking of the one is not the thinking of the other' (pp. 51-52). It is well to have this distinction made plain, for it is usually disregarded by many thinkers, particularly by those of the idealistic persuasion. The concrete universal is sometimes lacking in concreteness, and the difficulty with all such schemes is that they do not adequately recognize the individual in his individuality. Our author, however, strives for unity, and that unity he finds in a system in which all subjects are, through which they become themselves, and to the building up of which they each contribute. We have found this line of thought to be fruitful.

We should have liked to dwell on the subsequent chapters, more especially on the chapters dealing with Thought, Unity and Multiplicity, and on the Absolute. Let us quote a paragraph from the summary: 'Every subject is a centre of the phenomenal universe, in the unity of all phenomena,—a secondary, that is to say, a particular, unity: *i.e.*, not unique, but one among many ordered among themselves, but still a unity of the whole phenomenal world. This latter is a system of more or less developed subjects. And phenomena are interconnected variations of the single subjects. Every subject varies in so far as its spontaneous variations interfere with those of all the rest, the course of events implies both as logical factors, which are the spontaneities of the single subjects, and a logical factor, on which the interfering of the single spontaneities according to necessary laws depends. The logical factor, on which the necessity of thought is founded, is the supreme unity of the universe—a unity which, while it connects the subjects, is constitutive of each, so that each subject exists only as belonging to the system' pp. (262-263). One remark we make as we close. We are pleased with the fact that the author makes room for a doctrine of the value of the individual, and for a rational doctrine of freedom. For freedom has been attacked from many sides, and the latest has been from the new doctrine of

heredity. The new development of Mendelism leaves no room for freedom or spontaneity. And the doctrine of development, or of nurture versus nature, as set forth in these subtle pages forms a splendid vindication of the possibility of freedom,

and of the worth of the individual. It at once provides for the unity of the universe, for the worth of the individual, and for the reality of ideals.

JAMES IVERACH.

Aberdeen.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Chapter viii.

18-22. The corresponding passage in the Babylonian story (where the account of the descent of Utu-napistim himself from the ship has dropped out of the text) is:

I sent (them) forth to the four winds ; I offered sacrifice ;
I built an altar upon the peak of the mountain ;
seven by seven I placed the libation vases ;
below them I spread reeds, cedar-wood, and myrtle.
The gods smelled the savour,
the gods smelled the sweet savour,
the gods gathered like flies over the sacrifice.

The literal translation of the line, 'the gods smelled the sweet (*literally* 'the good') savour,' leaves no doubt that the Hebrew translator had the same cuneiform text that we have before him ; but, as elsewhere, the polytheism of the Babylonian story becomes monotheistic. As in the Babylonian version, moreover, so in the Hebrew account we have first the animal sacrifice, and then the burnt-offering, which in Babylonia consisted of sweet-smelling woods placed under the sacrificed animal, but here, in accordance with the Mosaic ritual, becomes the 'ôlâh, or 'burnt (animal) offering.' In accordance also with the Mosaic ritual, 'clean' animals and fowl are selected for the sacrifice, which explains why the clean animals were introduced into the ark (7²). As they take the place of the libation vases in the Babylonian narrative, we have further an explanation of the statement that these clean animals were taken 'by sevens.'

In the Babylonian poem the gathering of the gods round the sacrifice is followed by Istar's denunciation of Ellil for having caused the deluge, and of the gods who had acted as his ministers ; by the anger of Ellil at finding that Utu-napistim had escaped destruction ; and by his acceptance of

the 'wise' words of Ea that henceforward the individual alone should be responsible for his own sins : 'Lay on the sinner (alone) his sin ; lay on the transgressor his transgression ; be merciful that he be not cut off, be long-suffering that he be not [destroyed].' All this is necessarily omitted by the Hebrew monotheist, who passes on to the acceptance by Ellil of the counsel of Ea, which was, on the one hand, that the individual, and not 'every thing living,' should suffer for the individual's sins ; and, on the other hand, that the punishment inflicted on man for his sins should be confined to man—lions, hyænas, famine, or plague—and not extended, as in the case of the deluge, to the ground. Accordingly, in v.²¹, 'Yahweh says to his heart' that the curse inflicted on 'the ground' by the disobedience of Adam and the murder of Cain is finally removed from it, and that He 'will not again smite any more every thing living.' For the meaning of this last passage—that the individual should henceforth bear his own sin—we have to turn to the Babylonian story, the Hebrew writer not having explained it. The Hebrew code which admitted the principle of blood-revenge, and the participation of the community in the guilt of its members, differed from the code of Khammu-rabi, which assumed that the individual was responsible to the law for his actions.

In the Babylonian story there is nothing corresponding with v.²². 𐎶𐎵, 'ôdh, is the Ass. adû, 'the time of all the days of the earth,' and is used as in *adû Nannari*, 'the time of the Moon,' i.e. as long as the moon exists. Yishbôthû is the Ass. sabātu, 'to keep Sabbath' ; a phrase quoted from an early bilingual poem is *sabātu sa abubi*, 'the keeping sabbath' or 'cessation of the deluge' ; see note on

2³. God's work of creation ended with the Sabbath; but the promise made by Yahweh after the deluge was that the ordinary revolutions of nature should never keep Sabbath again.

Chapter ix.

1. In the Babylonian story, as here, the blessing of Utu-napistim (in which his wife is included) follows the promise of Ellil never again to send a deluge upon the earth. The blessing involves the translation of Utu-napistim and his wife to the Babylonian Paradise; in Genesis this is transferred to the other Adra-khasiš, or 'Very Wise,' Enoch (see note on 5²⁴). The words of the blessing are taken from 1²⁸⁻³⁰, with those slight variations which distinguish the Biblical writer from the author of the Assyro-Babylonian Epic of the Creation, who repeats the same passage time after time without alteration. We have here, in fact, a result of the difference between prose and verse, and the freedom the Biblical writer allows himself when quoting an earlier passage of his own work illustrates the similar freedom he allowed himself when translating from a cuneiform original (see note, 8⁶⁻¹²). As the words of the blessing are taken from 1²⁸⁻³⁰, the sons of Noah are necessarily included in it.

3. 'Namely, that liveth' is an explanatory gloss upon *remesh*, the Ass. *nammassû*, which is used here as if it were *nammastu* (see note on 8¹⁷).

In 1^{29, 30} only 'the green herb' was given as food to man and beast, since no flesh-meat was eaten in Paradise; the expulsion of man from the garden of Eden not only forced him to 'eat bread' 'in the sweat of his face,' but also to have recourse to animal food. Permission to eat the latter is now formally granted, nothing being said about 'clean' and 'unclean' meats. On the contrary, 'all' that has life among the lower animals may be the food of man; the restrictions of the Mosaic Law have not yet come into operation.

4. Blood alone is forbidden to be eaten, for the blood is life (see Lv 17¹¹). That the blood was life was a Babylonian belief, and Berossus tells us that the first men were formed of the earth and the blood of the gods. Zimmern has detected a reference to this myth in a mutilated cuneiform text (C.T. vi.; Bu. 91-5-9, 269; see Jensen, *Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen und Epen*, p. 275). The conception that the blood was the life goes

back to a different origin from that which identified life with the divine breath (Gn 2⁷), though both beliefs were Babylonian, as they were also Hebrew. The Tel el-Amarna writers, for example, call the Pharaoh *sari napisti-ya*, 'the breath of my life.' But the identification of life with the breath was connected with Ea, 'the god of the good wind'; while its identification with the blood was connected with Ellil, or Bel of Nippur, who was said to have cut off 'the heads of himself and the other gods' in order to form a man with blood (see Eusebius, *Chron. Arm.*, ed. Mai, p. 10). Both 'the god of the good wind' and the god who thus formed man from his own blood were subsequently identified with Bel-Merodach when the latter became the creator of the world. In Assyrian the verse would have been *sêru* (or *bisru*) *sa inasu damu ul takulu*.

5, 6. Here we have the principle of blood-revenge, which is embodied in the Mosaic Law, and extends to beast as well as to man (see, e.g., Ex 21²⁸). The recognition of this principle is one of the great points of difference between the Mosaic Code and the Babylonian Code of Khammu-rabi, where its place is taken, as in modern codes, by the doctrine of the supreme authority of the civil law which overrides public feuds and private revenge, and fixes the penalty for every offence. There are no traces of a Babylonian original in v.⁵. In v.⁶, however, we again have them, the Assyrian form of the verse being *tabiku damê nisi nisu damê-su itbuk, assum ina tsalam ilâni êpisu teniseti*. We find the phrase *damê tappê-su ittabak*, 'has he poured out the blood of his companion?' in *W.A.I.* v. 51, 52.

8-17. The covenant of which the rainbow was a 'token' is not referred to in the Babylonian story of the Deluge contained in the Epic of Gilgames. It must have been found, however, in one of the versions of the story current in Babylonian literature, since an early hymn (*W.A.I.* ii. 19. 2, 8) mentions the *qastu sa abubi*, 'bow of the deluge,' where the word used for 'bow' is not the usual Assyrian word *tilpânu*, but one which corresponds with the Heb. *qesheth*. It is possible that 'the story of the bow,' 'lifted up in heaven' by Anu the sky-god, with which Merodach was armed when he fought against Tiamât, was also the rainbow. It will be remembered that in the Biblical narrative *tehôm* or Tiamât plays a leading part in bringing about the flood. 'Every living creature' (vv.^{12, 15}) is the Ass.

sikin napisti (kalama). In v.¹¹ we have 'the waters of the deluge' as in 7¹⁰; in v.¹⁶ this is replaced by the Assyrianism *לִמְבַל הַמַּיִם*, which is a literal rendering of the Ass. *mê sa bubbuli*. We may see in the two expressions alternative translations of the same original.

Let us now see how the results of the foregoing analysis harmonize with the current theory which divides the Biblical narrative between an 'Elohist' and a 'Yahwist.' The 'Elohist' agrees with the Babylonian story in the following points:—(1) Noah is the tenth from the first man; (2) the Deluge is due to the sins of mankind; (3) all living things are involved in the calamity except such as are preserved in the ark; (4) the deity reveals to Noah the approach of the Deluge and instructs him how to build the ark; (5) the deity prescribes the dimensions of the ark, which is divided into rooms and storeys and pitched within and without; (6) Noah takes his family into the ark with him; (7) the ark has a window; (8) the ark rests on one of the Armenian mountains; (9) after the subsidence of the Deluge, Noah offers sacrifice on the mountain, and God declares that He will not again destroy the world by a flood.

The 'Yahwist' agrees with the Babylonian story in the following points:—(1) The Deluge is a punishment for sin; (2) it destroys all living things except those that were in the ark; (3) the period of seven days is known to him; (4) the Deluge is caused by a downpour of rain; (5) birds are sent from the ark three times in order to ascertain if the earth is dry; (6) two of these birds are the dove and the raven; (7) Noah builds an altar and offers sacrifice after the Deluge, and Yahweh 'smelled the sweet savour.' In other passages the 'Yahwist' shows that he is acquainted with the Babylonian story by changing or contradicting its statements; thus the swallow is omitted in the account of the sending out of the birds, and Yahweh closes the door of the ark instead of Noah himself. Throughout the 'Yahwistic' portions of the narrative, in fact, we have the same evidences of tacit contradiction of the polytheism inherent in the Babylonian story that we have found in Gn 1, which, however, is said to belong to the 'Elohist.' It is in these 'Yahwistic' portions, moreover, that the actual words of the cuneiform text are the most frequently reproduced.

The logical conclusions to be drawn from these facts are given in my *Early History of the Hebrews*. I have there said (p. 125): 'It will be noticed that the coincidences between the Babylonian and Hebrew narratives are quite as much in details as in general outlines, and these coincidences cover the Hebrew narrative as a whole. It is not with the Elohist or with the Yahwist alone that the Babylonian poet agrees, but with the supposed combination of their two documents as we now find it in the Book of Genesis. If the documentary hypothesis were right, there would be only two ways of accounting for this fact. Either the Babylonian poet (who lived in the Abrahamic age) had before him the present "redacted" text of Genesis, or else the Elohist and Yahwist must have copied the Babylonian story upon the mutual understanding that the one should insert what the other omitted. There is no third alternative. In order to explain the phenomena of the Hebrew text we must therefore have recourse to some other hypothesis than that which finds in it the work of an "Elohist" and a "Yahwist."'

The detailed comparison of it with the version of the Babylonian story contained in the Epic of Gilgames has shown that—

- (1) Behind the Biblical account lie the Babylonian versions of the story.
- (2) One of these, which has been translated into Hebrew, is the version which we have in the Epic of Gilgames.
- (3) This is shown not only by the translations, but still more by the omissions and tacit contradictions of the Babylonian account on the part of the Hebrew translator.
- (4) Another account in Babylonian cuneiform, which has also been translated, was written in Palestine, or at all events from the point of view of an inhabitant of Palestine.
- (5) The translations are free, and characterized by explanatory amplifications which remind us of the Mishna.
- (6) Alternative translations of the Babylonian original occur, producing at times a 'conflate' text or the insertion of a word or words in the wrong place.
- (7) In certain passages we find the language of the Tel el-Amarna tablets (e.g. *sâru napisti, tsukhru*, etc.).

- (8) The narrative, as we have it, is a consecutive whole which corresponds with the Babylonian account, and displays throughout one spirit and aim.
- (9) The inconsistencies discoverable in it are

due to intentional alteration of the Babylonian account.

- (10) The text has undergone but little change since the Septuagint translation was made.

Contributions and Comments.

'Conflict in Prayer.'

Too cold in prayer, we miss the promise given
Of Victory, which wrestling saints attain;
Which Abraham secured on Mamre's plain;
Which Jacob at Penue! won from God.
Our slothful, careless souls, in slumber nod,
When there awaits their energies such gain
As God delights to give! Why then refrain
From passionate prayer which triumphs over
Heaven? WILLIAM OLNEY, *Deacon*.

Metropolitan Tabernacle, London.

The Denial of St. Peter.

No fair estimate of a historical character can be founded upon mere assumption. Now, though the fact of St. Peter's denial is recorded by all the Evangelists, his motives are explained by none. Why should it be confidently assumed that his reason was a cowardly fear of arrest and punishment, especially when we know him to have affirmed, not long before, that he would welcome such a fate by his Master's side? Many human heroes have won the love of faithful friends. Jesus must surely, contrary to our beliefs, have been a poor judge of human character, or He must have deliberately selected His disciples from the weakest men of Palestine, if the bravest of them all, the man whom He honoured with the surname of 'Rock,' was so weak and waterish at the critical hour. St. Peter's resolution to go with our Lord to prison and to judgment was not of an extraordinary nature. If the companionship of Jesus was at all inspiring, it is exactly what we should have expected from one who had already left all to follow Him. We have proof enough that he intended to be true to his promise. His action with the sword in the garden, his refusal to follow

the other disciples in their flight, his arrival at the courtyard of the high priest's house, all show that he had not forgotten his words: 'Though all forsake thee, yet will not I.' There is surely more reason for assuming that his denial was due to his desire to remain by Christ's side than to a mere cowardly fear of imprisonment.

The facts recorded by the Evangelists bear out this hypothesis. No Gospel conveys the slightest hint of any intention on the part of the Sanhedrin to apprehend the disciples with their Master. The members of the band sent out by the priest were sufficiently numerous and well armed to have encircled the Galileans and to have made their escape impossible, had this course been deemed advisable by their officers. Apparently their orders were to seize the Leader alone since they required the services of Judas to identify Him by a kiss. When asked their designs they mentioned no other name save that of Jesus of Nazareth. Christ Himself interpreted their answer as an assurance of His followers' safety, nor did they demur at His request, 'If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way.' St. Peter made himself sufficiently conspicuous in the garden. His attack upon Malchus was a challenge to the high priest's minions to arrest him. His action could scarcely have been overlooked unless they had received strict injunctions to leave every one but Jesus unmolested. Such a command is quite intelligible considering what we know of the perplexity of the rulers and their fear of any action likely to arouse strife among the populace (Mk 14¹¹ and Lk 22⁵³).

We notice that the companion of St. Peter had some pass to admit him to the high priest's house. If this 'other disciple' was, as we think most probable, Judas, the circumstance is in no way remarkable and throws no light upon the present question. If, however, this companion was St. John, the fact that the disciples were in no danger of capture seems proved beyond question. The

absence of all Scriptural censure shows that St. John made no denial of the Lord either by word or deed. He was in the high priest's courtyard as an avowed disciple. His character would not have stooped to any duplicity. If then he had been in any danger of trial for his life, could his friendship with the priest have saved him? The acquaintance was in all probability very slight. It could scarcely have protected him from the course of justice, but this much it might have done—it might have secured him an entrance which would have been refused to an unknown character, especially to an unknown follower of the Nazarene. It is conceivable that a little 'back-stairs influence,' such as a man could acquire in the pursuit of a fisherman's craft, might win him the privilege of being allowed admission where others of his persuasion were forbidden, but even the greatest personal friendship in high quarters would not have given him liberty to flaunt his presence in the eyes of the soldiers, if they had orders to capture him and his associates. Thus if St. John was St. Peter's companion we must regard it as certain that the disciples were not liable to arrest.

The real difficulty was apparently to get into the courtyard. St. Peter was challenged at the door. His first denial secured him admission from the portress (Jn 18¹⁷). Hence we may conclude that his repeated asseverations were designed to save him from ejection. Had there been any warrant out for the arrest of the disciples, the case of St. Peter would not have been treated so lightly by those who noted his strange conduct. His Galilean speech, his recognition by the brother of Malchus, and his exchange of looks with the Master were all highly suspicious circumstances. If he were arraignable on a capital charge, his case was treated with remarkable apathy. When, finally, he burst into tears and fled, every one must have known that he had been lying, yet he was not pursued. If he had been 'wanted' by the Sanhedrin, he would surely have been followed and brought back. No difficulty was put in the way of his retiral. In fact, we feel that his exit was followed by a burst of mocking laughter. The servants of the high priest were completely satisfied when he left the courtyard, this being the aim of all their cross-examination.

We conclude, then, that St. Peter did not fear these underlings who tormented him with their

questions. They were to him like a swarm of malicious flies. He knew that his discovery, as a disciple, would cause his instant ejection from the place, where he desired to be. He had lied to secure his admission, and he continued to lie in order that he might remain by his Master's side. He lied, not at all like a man afraid, but impatiently, petulantly, and roughly. There was no cringing or obsequiousness in the manner of his speech. His curses were the anger of a man who desired peace from a petty persecution, not of one who swore for the sake of his life. The lies and denials floated over the surface of his mind, but deep down in his heart was the feeling that he was being true to his great resolve, 'Though all forsake thee, yet will not I.' It would be a great psychological puzzle if he could be proved to have forgotten that promise, so recently made. Our Lord's warning, that he should beware of boasting lest some twelve or twenty-four hours should find him ready for denial, had only made him more emphatic (Mk 14³¹). Rightly received, the caution might have served as a tonic, and was probably designed as such. It succeeded, however, only in making St. Peter somewhat unthinkingly stubborn. He repeated his resolution until the necessity of remaining by the Master's side became almost an obsession. Had he been afraid, he would have lied to the portress and immediately sought some way of escape from his dangerous situation. As it was, cheated of the arrest he sought by the action of Christ and of the soldiers, he continued to be true to the letter of his promise until he contradicted its spirit. Eager to go with his Master to prison and to judgment he consented to be separated from Him in heart by such a declaration as, 'I know not the man.' The vehemence of his testimony to his own loyalty made him an apostate. This explanation fits in with what we know of the character of the man. His usual faults were not cowardice and vacillation, but impetuosity and self-will. We have abundant evidence that our Lord considered him headstrong: 'When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest.' A man of this nature should not be believed guilty of pusillanimous wavering except upon the strongest evidence, but, as we have sought to show, the Gospels do not provide us with any reason to believe that his actions on the night of the betrayal were due to anything else than his usual impetuosity. They show us, not a

strong will, curbed and cowed by the fear of death, but a hot-headed man, determined to have his own way by means fair or foul.

We believe, then, that St. Peter's famous lapse was the result of self-will grown stubborn, proud, and impatient, and not at all of cowardice. His disloyalty was a fault much more refined than that of which he is commonly accused, but it was sufficiently dishonourable to wring the tears of penitence from his heart. He learned the lesson of his fall, for, afterwards, in answer to our Lord's question, 'Art thou more loyal than these?' he answered not, 'Though all should forsake thee, yet will not I,' but modestly, humbly, and brokenly, 'Lord, thou knowest that I love thee.'

W. D. GARDINER.

*Saint Madoes Manse,
Glencarse, Perth.*

A Solution of the Chief Difficulties in Revelation xx.-xxii.

THAT there are, if not extraneous sources of the matter, at any rate stages or strata in the thought of these chapters, appears from such data as the two descriptions of the divine city;¹ and in view of the confusion and obscurity apparent in the synthesis, it was to be expected that the attempt to rearrange the text would eventually be made, as one among the number of possible solutions. Nor is there any *a priori* objection to this particular method of solution, which has often been employed in Biblical exegesis.

The further question is whether the particular scheme of rearrangement proposed by Canon Charles is satisfactory. One link in the chain of exegetical argument struck me as weak. The question, What becomes of the first city? is insufficiently answered in Canon Charles's reconstruction.

Not content, however, with merely indicating the defect, I should like to contribute something towards making it good.

Let us look more closely at the first city—for the moment accepting Dr. Agar Beet's statement that Canon Charles has, in fact, divided the one city, heretofore recognized, into two. According to Canon Charles, the first city is depicted in 21⁹⁻²⁷

22^{1, 2} 22^{14, 15, 17}; and in the final mention of it, in 20⁹, it is called 'the beloved city.'

Now it seems to me that Canon Charles's commentary (in the magazine) exhibits at this point a confusion of ideas which his text avoids. He calls *this* city 'the New Jerusalem.' That is just what, according to the text, it is not. It is the *second* city, which appears after the judgment and upon the new earth, that is called 'the New Jerusalem.' The epithet *καὶνὴ* does not appear in the first description at all.

In truth, the first city, however much blessed and divinely illumined, is still mundane. Dr. Moffatt had already detected the fundamental earthliness of the description in 21⁹-22⁵ (rather ²).² This city symbolizes the idealized Church of the present world-order. All that Jerusalem has ever in history represented of the truth, righteousness, and love of God, striving to evangelize the present world, stands before us in the description of the first city. In the thought of the section, men have come universally to recognize the Church and her mission; yet not always with a loving recognition. They hear her invitation; yet not always with a responsive ear.

For it is to be observed—J. Weiss and others have called attention to this fact—that the beloved city is situated on the earth, indeed, but on the highest part of it. The forces of evil go up against her in their final effort.

This determining of the city's situation is in itself significant eschatologically. It is a transitional feature. We perceive in it a prevision of the development which the Apocalypticist is about to announce.

As these forces mount to the attack, the storm of divine judgment sweeps over the heaven and earth, which retreat, or rather disappear into nothingness before it. Not so the beloved city. It stands firm on its eminence. That is the last sight we get of it before the clouds and fires of judgment hide it from our view.

When the storm is over, the city appears again. Now, however, it is *καὶνὴ*; it shines forth 'in neuer Gestalt.'

There seems to have been much speculation in the Apocalyptic era, as to whether, at the end of the world-age, Jerusalem was to be re-established and rebuilt, or transformed, or removed and replaced by an entirely new Jerusalem. In Ezk 40² the

¹ See J. Weiss, in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, B. ii. S. 680. Göttingen.

² Moffatt, *Lit. New Test.*, p. 495.

Temple, as the centre of *יהודה ישמה*, i.e. the restored Jerusalem fully and permanently indwelt by God, is rebuilt on the ancient mountain.¹ In Deutero-Isaiah, Jerusalem is not merely, as in Ezekiel, rebuilt and rearranged, but transfigured.² The latter writer, however, was far in advance of his age in largeness and spirituality of view; and some of the subsequent Apocalyptists not only made no further progress but retrograded, in their speculations on the destiny of Jerusalem. In the forecast of the Psalms of Solomon,³ the city is to be restored as it was at first; and similarly in the Sybilline Oracles.⁴ In the Book of Tobit, the imagination is exercised on the adornment of the restored Jerusalem,⁵ the sense of beauty manifested in Deutero-Isaiah is revived, and preparation is made for the expansion of the idea of adornment in the Johannine Apocalypse. The ideas of fundamental transformation, transfigurement, and newness are not, however, present in the Book of Tobit.

2 Esdras gives the conception of the restoration of Jerusalem a mystical turn. The city, by an act of transformation, appears suddenly on a void stage.⁶ In the Syrian Apocalypse of Baruch, the old Jerusalem is represented as shaken down and temporarily rebuilt; again overthrown, and finally renewed in everlasting glory.⁷ The Apocalyptic has by this time travelled some way along the lines of newness and transformation in connexion with Jerusalem; though, as above hinted, it has produced nothing up to the literary and inspirational standard of Deutero-Isaiah.

It remains to notice the Enochian speculations. Crude indeed they are, but radical in their penetration. In En 90, the old Jerusalem is not transformed, but wrapped up and carried away, and a new house (city) is brought in its place.

We come now to the teaching of our Apocalypse about Jerusalem. A note in the Italian commentary published by the Società Fides et Amor (Roma) gives us a clue to the attitude of the New Testament Apocalyptist towards the speculations just referred to. This commentator says that the Apocalyptist is combining the two ideas of the limited and mundane, and of the eternal and supramundane Messianic reigns. He is likewise fusing the various notions of the re-establishment

of Jerusalem. This consideration disposes of the objection made by Dr. Agar Beet, that Canon Charles's interpretation introduces two cities where one has hitherto been recognized by Biblical students. For we are, in fact, confronted, not with two cities, but with two eschatological aspects, one mundane, the other supramundane, of one city.

The fact that the phrase 'coming down out of heaven from God' occurs in both descriptions is at first sight strange, and suggestive of redactorial confusion or interpolation. On reflexion, however, it will be seen to constitute a due connecting link. For the phrase is not to be understood spatially or locally. It is the generic title of Jerusalem, expressive of her relation to God; applicable not less to her mundane⁸ than to her supramundane aspect. In either case, she has a mission from God.

Thus, in fine, just as the earthly mission of Jesus Christ ended in failure, and it is in His supramundane life that He achieves victory—as the theological truths of the Resurrection and the Ascension symbolize and declare; so to the evangelizing Church is granted no prevision of triumph in this world-order; for the activity of her enemies continues to the end. But she is promised fulness of success in another world-order. Her broken arcs of this life will be completed, and become perfect rounds in a life beyond.

Fulness of success. I had chosen the words deliberately before writing them down; yet it is only timidly and feebly that the mind can grasp their significance. Is it credible, this which the scheme of reconstruction implies—that the closing scenes of the Apocalypse really foretell the complete victory of the gospel; really anticipate a total newness of the universe in which no such painful and ugly facts of consciousness as we now experience shall any longer exist, when they shall have been burnt up as fuel in the world-process, and have become transformed, unrecognizable, forgotten, as burning wood passes into gas? Do they, indeed, announce the coming of another world-order, wherein the one recognizable link with the painful past shall be the Church, the mystical Body of the Redeemer; and the new heaven and earth shall fill all things, and nothing shall exist but what can live in harmony with them?

¹ Cp. Davidson, *in loc.*

² See v. Orelli, *O.T. Prophecy*, p. 413.

³ 17⁸⁰. ⁴ 5^{414ff.} ⁵ 13^{16f.}

⁶ 10^{25ff.} ⁷ Ch. 32.

⁸ The idea appears in connexion with the idealized mundane Jerusalem, in He 11¹⁰.

Surely, many will urge, such thoroughgoing universalism goes beyond Scripture, rather than completes it; nay, does it not stand condemned by the Apocalypse itself? For does not this line of reconstructive exegesis merely evade, not solve, that other eschatological problem, the duration of the Lake of Fire?

Well, let us face the facts, or rather one great, outstanding eschatological fact, which emerges from Canon Charles's scheme of reconstruction. It is that at the close of the Millennium, the Lake of Fire, into which have been thrown whatever spiritual agencies of evil are covered by the symbols Satan, the Beast, the False Prophet, and also all the unconverted, regarded as instruments of those agencies, sinks out of sight in the new creation. It is no longer mentioned. What should be inferred from this fact? That it still burns beneath the surface, under the foundations? Or that it no longer exists?

It is significant that at this stage the author at any rate exhibits no tendency, as he has previously done (in ch. 14), to exult over the punitive sufferings of the lost.¹ There is even some doubt whether the references to the Book of Life in 20¹¹⁻¹⁵ are not glosses. They suit ill with the rest of the thought.

But however this may be, it becomes clear on closer inspection that the eschatology of these concluding chapters tells us only that the punishment of evil will continue as long as evil exists. The connotation of the expression εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων is indefiniteness. It does not exclude, but neither does it obtrude, the idea of endless duration. Æonian duration could not, in fact, according to scriptural usage, *essentially* connote endlessness; for that usage admits, in connexion with God's existence, the expression πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων; and the obvious implication is that God is not tied to the æonian system. He could eliminate it from the universal order.

An important, but usually ignored, distinction has in fact to be drawn between the notional and the actual existence of the conditions symbolized by the Lake of Fire. As I hope to show in a forthcoming article in *The Modern Churchman*, the eternal hell in Christian doctrine is an idea. By its predication, the Church means that evil will be punished as long as is needful. If there existed infinite and absolute evil, there would be infinite

and absolute punishment likewise; and all the sensational language that has ever been used by preachers on this subject would be inadequate to present its horror. That is the governing idea of ethical religion. But then, absolute evil does *not* exist as fact; and faith in the infinite goodness of God assures us that it never will exist as fact.

Canon Charles's discovery of the plan of these chapters must be classed as one of those events which will exercise a determining influence on the theology of the future. Christian thought has of late been tending more and more to the acceptance of ethical universalism as the solution of the problem of eternal punishment.²

Now at length the vision of that consummation unfolds itself to us, in a literary setting where we had not looked for it, in the most fiercely polemical book of the divine library of Scripture, where the hatred of evil becomes so intense that divines and exegetes have ere now shrunk from it appalled. In the light of this reconstruction we can endure and even welcome this revealing of unmitigated, glowing indignation. We know that, as it comes before us in this book, it is an ideal. It is an essential part of that whole creative scheme which admits ethical processes, and which in its infinite fulness includes the ideal as well as the actual world. And we now perceive that the concrete realizations of this ideal will not only not disappoint, they will aid in fulfilling, the original design of creative love. The final vision of the Apocalypse, as it now comes before us, is glorious with undimmed glory. It assures us that the universe is perfectible, and will be perfected. It seals up the sum of the manifold message of revelation, with a forecast that is at once perfect in wisdom and perfect in beauty.

H. NORTHCOTE.

Boulogne-sur-Mer.

Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ.

PROBABLY the most generally accepted explanation of the phrase is that it was due to a bilingual period in the Church, when the formula was familiar. It thus superseded the simple Ἀββὰ, or ὁ πατήρ, came into the early Christian vocabulary, and thus into the Epistle to the Romans (8¹⁵) and the Second Gospel (14³⁶). If this were so the omission of the formula in the Gospel parallels

¹ Cp. J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 677.

² Principal Garvie, in Hastings' *ERE.*, art. 'Christianity.'

would be inexplicable. The editors of Mt. and Lk. would not hesitate to change Mk.'s phraseology, but they would scarcely drop one-half of an established Church formula. It is possible that these editors regarded the words as mere iteration, according to a Galilean colloquialism (cf. *מרי כירי*, *vide* Schöttgen *ad loc.*), and they avoided the tautology. Matthew writes *πάτερ μου* only (26³⁹), and Luke *πάτερ* only (22⁴²). If the second term were a mere interpretation of the first, we should expect a different construction. The writer of Mk., after his custom, would have used the familiar *ὁ ἔστιν μεθερμηνεύμενον* (cf. 5⁴¹), or simply *ὁ ἔστιν* (cf. 7³⁴), before *πατήρ*. Behind the Greek phrase, we suggest, there were two Aramaic words, or rather two forms of one word, viz. *אבא* and *אבי*. In the vernacular pronunciation there was probably little distinction in the sound of these two words, inasmuch as the final vowels were unuttered, or uttered indistinctly. In terms of personal address, however, the final vowels were better enunciated (cf. *רבי*, *Ῥαββί*, and *רבוני*, *Ῥαββουνεί*), and we may suppose that there was at least a slight difference in sound between *אבא* and *אבי*. It is to be observed that *אבא* was frequently used for 'my father' (Targ. Onk. *saepe*), and even for 'our father' (Talmud, *infrequens*). The suffixed form, however, was in use (cf. *אבי*, Dn 5¹³), but became more rare in post-Christian times. It is interesting to notice that in some Phoenician inscriptions the form *אבי* means 'his father' (*vide* C.I.S. i. 58; Brit. Mus., Cyprus Room, No. 31). From the iteration *אבא אבא* we could get either *πάτερ*, *πάτερ*, or *πάτερ μου*, *πάτερ μου*. But the variants in the First and Third Gospels are against this interpretation. The expression was evidently a memorable one in the Apostolic Church; not only unique, but impressive and wonderful. We are tempted to accept the Syriac (the dialect most akin to the Aramaic of Palestine) form of the phrase, *אָבִי אָבִי*, as best preserving the original. The prayer of Jesus was therefore in effect: 'Father (*אבא*)! My Father (*אבי*)!' The variants, *πάτερ* (Lk.) and *πάτερ μου* (Mt.), certainly favour this suggestion, and together they make up the Greek phrase required: *πάτερ, μάτερ μου*.

J. COURTENAY JAMES.

Harrogate.

A Problem in Jeremiah.

IN the Book of Jeremiah there is a section which begins with 21¹¹ and ends with 22³⁰, and which probably bore the original title *לְבֵית מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה*, 'concerning the royal house.' In it are preserved several short but pregnant oracles containing the prophet's verdict on the successive kings under whom he lived, and implicitly his view of the functions of the kingly office in Judah. To read this, especially in connexion with the relative passages from the Book of Kings, makes one concur heartily in Duhm's regret that the history of the kingdom of Judah was not written for us by Jeremiah.

Within the section, however, occur two short passages (21^{13, 14} 22²⁰⁻²³) which have long raised doubts as to whether they have any bearing on the kings, their character or their fate. What I wish to urge here is that these passages really belong together, refer to the same subject, and are wholly out of place in their present position.

The earlier of the two consists of two verses. (21^{13f.}), where quite evidently a community, described as 'dweller in the plain, the rock of the tableland,' is addressed. The community is thought of as self-satisfied and self-confident, for they are represented as saying, 'Who shall come down against us, who shall penetrate to our abode?' The unsuitable position of the verses has been long and widely recognized: thus Dr. Driver regarded them as having been originally directed against some city other than Jerusalem, and as having been inserted here by an editor who made the mistake of thinking that Jerusalem was meant.

The latter of the two consists of four verses. 22²⁰⁻²³, and in it again a community is addressed. The people are summoned to lament their fate on elevated places as at 3²¹, and the three heights selected for the purpose are Lebanon, Bashan, and Abarim. Their lovers or allies (cf. 4³⁰) are broken: the wind is to shepherd their shepherds: their lovers are to go into captivity. The people, again described as dwelling in Lebanon and nesting among cedars, are to moan over a calamity which falls on them like the sudden pain of child-birth. Here the consensus of opinion for separating the verses from the following oracle on the fate of Jehoiachin is not so unanimous, for a considerable body of opinion thinks it possible that Jerusalem is here summoned to lament over the captivity of its king. There are obvious difficulties in the way:

thus, such a method of introducing the verdict on Jehoiachin is unlike the abrupt pointed method of the other oracles; Jerusalem's allies in 597 were hard to find; it is not easy to conceive the community of Judah as very deeply afflicted over the fate of the eighteen-year-old lad who had maintained his throne for only three months.

Now 22²⁰⁻²³ forms a natural sequel to 21^{18f.} in sense. After Yahweh has smitten the people (21^{14b}), they are summoned to lament their fate (22²⁰), because they are now helpless (vv. 21^{f.}), and because their God has given them up (v. 23). It forms a natural sequel, because the same community is addressed. That community is described (21¹³) as 'יֹשֶׁבֶת הָעֵמֶק צִוֵּר הַמִּישׁוֹר', 'inhabitant of the vale, rock of the tableland'—a curious phrase, since it is not easy to see what the rock of a tableland is, nor how an abode can be at once in a rock and a vale. Yet the versions give no variation from the M.T., for while the LXX translate צִוֵּר by Tyre, that implies no departure from the text. The difficulty lies in צִוֵּר, for plain and tableland are supported by the boast of the community, 'who shall come down against us?' and are set in similar parallel in Jer 48⁸. But הַמִּישׁוֹר has the special sense of the plateau which lies between the Arnon and Heshbon (Dt 3¹⁰ 4⁴³, Jos 13⁹. 16. 17. 21 20⁸, Jer 48²¹); and for the vale to perish, the plateau to be ruined, is in Jer 48⁸ equivalent to the destruction of Moab.

With this situation, across Jordan, agrees the description of the community in 22²⁰⁻²³. The people are bidden go up to lament on Lebanon, Bashan, and Abarim, which describe the heights reaching down Eastern Palestine and ending with that chain of which Mt. Nebo was the commanding summit. The further description 'thou that inhabitest Lebanon, and makest thy nest among the cedars' remains difficult, but at least possible. The common interpretation, which understands that the people felt themselves as safe as if they dwelt on the northern mountains or nested among its cedars, has always seemed to me unexampled and somewhat forced.

The moral situation is also the same. The community, which is addressed in both passages, is full of self-confidence through its situation and its friends; but it has forgotten the peril which arises from having Yahweh as its enemy. It has boasted how none can break into its safe isolation, and how many are its allies. Its ruin will come in a sudden agony like child-birth pangs.

It is not necessary to insist how unlike such a situation is to the friendless condition in which Judah found itself at the time of Jehoiachin, when Northern Israel was already exiled and all the gates of the country stood open to its enemies.

ADAM C. WELCH.

New College, Edinburgh.

Entre Nous.

Illustrations from the War.

The Editor offers a set of the *Great Texts of the Bible* (twenty volumes), or their equivalent in other books chosen from Messrs. T. & T. Clark's catalogue, for the best series of illustrations of the Bible on religious and ethical topics from incidents connected with the War. He offers also a set of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible* (six volumes)—or their equivalent as before—for the second best series. The texts or topics illustrated should be given, and the source of the illustration, together with the date.

The illustrations should be sent before the end of August. They must refer to incidents occurring not earlier than February.

Kabir.

One Hundred Poems of Kabir have been translated by Rabindranath Tagore, with the assistance

of Evelyn Underhill (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). Kabir was born in or near Benares, of Moham-medan parents, probably about the year 1440. In early life he became a disciple of the celebrated Hindu ascetic Rāmānanda. He became himself a mystic—one of 'that small group of supreme mystics,' says Miss Underhill, 'amongst whom St. Augustine, Ruysbroeck, and the Sūfī poet Jalālu'ddīn Rūmī are perhaps the chief—who have achieved that which we might call the synthetic vision of God.'

One average quotation will give a taste of the mysticism, the poetry and the translation:

All things are created by the Om;

The love-form is His body.

He is without form, without quality, without decay

Seek thou union with Him!

But that formless God takes a thousand form
 in the eyes of His creatures:
 He is pure and indestructible,
 His form is infinite and fathomless,
 He dances in rapture, and waves of form arise
 from His dance,
 The body and the mind cannot contain them-
 selves, when they are touched by His great joy.
 He is immersed in all consciousness, all joys,
 and all sorrows;
 He has no beginning and no end;
 He holds all within His bliss.

Maurice Maeterlinck.

Mr. Bernard Miall has translated into English the early poems of Maeterlinck. The title is simply *Poems* (Methuen; 5s. net).

'It is safe to assert,' says the translator, 'that the writer of these poems had read his Verlaine, his Rimbaud, his Mallarmé, and his Baudelaire, and of English-speaking poets Emerson, Poe, perhaps Rossetti, and above all Whitman. But he is no disciple; and his essential originality, and the keynote of his æsthetics, is a system of symbolism.'

What the Symbols signify it is beyond Mr. Miall's skill to certify, and he cannot ask Maeterlinck because 'his country is being crucified by the powers of darkness, and he has other and sterner matters to think of.'

The metre of the original is mostly that of 'In Memoriam,' but the translator has claimed some freedom. This is one of the lyrics as he has 'done' it:

PRAYER.

Thou know'st, O Lord, my spirit's dearth:
 Thou see'st the worth of what I bring:
 The evil blossoms of the earth,
 The light upon a perished thing.

Thou see'st my sick and weary mood:
 The moon is dark, the dawn is slain.
 Thy glory on my solitude
 Shed Thou like fructifying rain.

Light Thou, O Lord, beneath my feet
 The way my weary soul should pass,
 For now the pain of all things sweet
 Is piteous as the ice-bound grass.

The Brontës.

Under the title of *Brontë Poems*, Mr. A. C. Benson has published a selection from the poetry of Charlotte, Emily, Anne, and Branwell Brontë (Smith, Elder & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). In his introduction, which has the charm of his best writing, he gives his opinion freely on the merits of the poetry, and compares the one member of the family

with the other. His order is Emily, Branwell, Charlotte, Anne. He speaks, also, of the attitude to life of each of them. 'Branwell alone of the four had no moral patience, no power of defiance. Emily achieved it by her lofty independence of spirit, Charlotte by courage and tenacious interest in life, Anne by a deep religious faith. But I believe Branwell to have possessed the artistic vision, though an early corruption of temperament leading to a base gaiety was fatal to all clearness and energy of presentment.'

The difficulty with the text of the poems is very great owing to 'the fact that the script of the original MSS is so minute as to be often hardly decipherable.'

Opposite page 210 a specimen of Emily's handwriting is given; and it is amusing to observe that Mr. Benson has deciphered the date amiss. He says May 13, 1843; it is certainly May 15. This is the poem:

Why ask to know what date, what clime?
 There dwelt our own humanity,
 Power-worshippers from earliest time,
 Feet-kissers of triumphant crime,
 Crushers of helpless misery,
 Crushing down Justice, honouring wrong,
 If that be feeble, this be strong.

Shedders of blood, shedders of tears,
 Fell creatures avid of distress;
 Yet mocking heaven with senseless prayers
 For mercy on the merciless.

It was the autumn of the year
 When grain grows yellow in the ear;
 Day after day, from noon to noon,
 That August's sun blazed bright as June.

But we with unregarding eyes
 Saw panting earth and glowing skies.
 No hand the reaper's sickle held,
 Nor bound the bright sheaves in the field.

Our corn was garnered months before,
 Threshed out and harvested with gore;
 Ground when the ears were milky sweet
 With furious toil of hoofs and feet;
 I, doubly cursed, on foreign sod,
 Fought neither for my home nor God.

Tales from the Trenches.

Mr. James W. Herries has reprinted some sketches of war incidents contributed by him to the newspapers. He calls the book *Tales from the Trenches* (Hodge; 1s. net). Among the rest there is an extraordinary story of three men belonging to the Irish Fusiliers who were on their way to a bayonet attack. 'The three comrades advance

abreast. A shell screams through the air. It passes and leaves the Belfast man headless. His two companions note instantaneously what has happened, but the momentum of the charge carries them on, and the headless Fusilier charges with them.

'That grim horror of a headless body, rifle and bayonet still held in position, runs on, step for step, along with the others, for a distance of some 15 yards, before it collapses and falls a huddled heap on the ground.

'It is an incident fit to try the nerves of the strongest. At the moment, however, its weird effect is lost in the tumult and excitement of the charge. It is only after the trenches have been stormed that the strangeness of this headless corpse, charging over the battlefield, with levelled rifle, comes home to the others.

'The story was told me by the six-foot Irishman, an unimpressible and matter-of-fact soldier type, who described the incident to me as something curious, but not particularly appalling. Many members of the hospital staffs, to whom I have told the story, have found it not at all surprising. The muscular action continuing after the control of the brain had been removed, and the general circumstances in which the incident occurred, fully account for what happened. From my knowledge of the Irishman, and his complete want of the imaginative faculty, I can personally vouch for his credibility.'

Great Deeds of the Great War.

What is the indispensable literature of the War? Among the rest, *T.P.'s Journal of Great Deeds* must find a place for the human element. *T.P.'s Journal of Great Deeds* is not a repertoire of anecdotes, that and nothing more. There are sustained articles by Rudyard Kipling, Archibald Hurd, W. Douglas Newton, T. Miller Maguire, and others, including, of course, T. P. O'Connor himself. And there are numerous photographs, well chosen and well prepared. Nevertheless the incidents and the anecdotes are at least a good spice to the pudding, and out of the first volume, which has just been published, we shall quote three of the most characteristic.

PURE WOMANLY.

'A woman ran out of the door of a solitary cottage towards Senlis, waving her arm. One

stops quickly these days. A man was dying inside. She had burned his uniform; but I knew at once he was a German. He had been shot while scouting, had hid himself, and crawled to her house. We did what we could for him. We left him to die in the care of the woman who had not "passed by on the other side." Her son would visit her shortly, and would bury him in the field. No one else was to know!'

THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

'The —th Corps has a Roman Catholic chaplain well known as the Père Narp, and a Jewish Rabbi, Mr. G. R. Ginsburger. They are excellent friends, and are equally distinguished for the good they do. One evening they had stayed too late, tending the wounded and dying in the field, to be able to re-enter the cantonments. They found a deserted cottage with a truckle bed, and both threw themselves down upon it, the Père Narp remarking, with sly wit, "What a pity, all the same, that there is not a photographer to take the Old and New Testament as bedfellows!"'

A BABY.

'The Germans had turned all the people out of a burning village, and rain fell in torrents. Bombardier Stoddard, 27th Battery of the R.F.A., found a baby crying in its cradle during a terrible moment, when he arrived with others at a village subjected to the usual desolation by the German invaders, and made a great effort to save its life. He carried it under his great-coat for five and a half miles, until the battery was about to go into action again. He laid the child under a hayrick, and covered it, in the hope that some one would find it and take care of it. But when the battery passed through the village afterwards he found that the hayrick had been destroyed by fire, and the child could not be found.'

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Henry R. Ridcock, East Dereham.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.